

BR 125 .H39 1929
Hawkins, Chauncey J. 1875-
1930.
Do the churches dare?

DO THE CHURCHES DARE?



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK . BOSTON . CHICAGO . DALLAS
ATLANTA . SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON . BOMBAY . CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

DO THE CHURCHES DARE?

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 12 1932
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY
CHAUNCEY J. HAWKINS

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1929

COPYRIGHT, 1929,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed.
Published October, 1929.

All rights reserved, including the right of reproduction
in whole or in part in any form.

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

TO

ROBERT BOONE HAWKINS

Whose conversations and letters, while studying in
the United States and Germany, have made
me eager to have some part in guiding
the inquiring mind of our day

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Present State of the Churches .	9
II.	Emergent Evolution and God . . .	24
III.	Emergent Evolution and the Deity of Christ	62
IV.	Religion of Redemption	107
V.	Worship	145

DO THE CHURCHES DARE?

CHAPTER I

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCHES

SINCERE churchmen are attempting to shut their eyes to the crisis that confronts them, but they manifest a restlessness which indicates that they are not entirely blind to the situation before the Church. Protestant leaders are pleading with their followers to cease from theological warfare and devote themselves to the "practical" work of the Church. Roman Catholic leaders are minimizing dogma and are attempting to capitalize the advantages which they imagine they won out of the late war. The conspicuous fact about modern Church life is that the leaders of organized Christianity are using every effort to stimulate "activity." They have adopted the methods of propaganda which have been used successfully by the secular world. All denominations of Protestantism, as well as the Roman Church,

make use of the newspaper, the religious press and tracts to scatter their ideas and methods over the earth. Every minister and priest, even in the remotest parish, is deluged with plans, appeals and commands issued from a central office. Committees are at work trying to drag young men into holy orders, a sign that the Church has lost her former spiritual compulsion. Missionary programs and "study classes" are issued to the multitudes, who wonder what it is all about. The "social gospel" is proclaimed from professorial chairs, but its zeal is checked by its vagueness. The Church was never more "active" than it is to-day, but we cannot escape the impression that all of this activity is an unconscious effort to cover a fundamental sickness which is depleting the Church of spiritual power.

The disturbing fact is, that while the Churches, both Protestant and Catholic, are engaged in this "revival of propaganda," they are rapidly losing the more intellectual classes, while their recruiting is largely from the less intellectual strata of society. Their appeal is chiefly to the emotions. They make free use of ritual, pageant, drama and effectively staged sermons. Few great pulpits in

Protestantism make any attempt to deal on a high intellectual plane with the fundamental problems of theology, such as God and his relation to the world, the person of Christ, or the problems of salvation and immortality, and the faithful in the pews have almost wholly ceased to do any serious thinking on these questions. They are content to cling to the "practices of religion" without any effort to justify them by reason. It is not otherwise in the Roman Church. Guignebert, professor of Christianity in the University of Paris, says: "In our days many priests bring their instructions to bear solely upon the great spiritual affirmations of religion and ethics; they neglect dogma deliberately, and in this way adjust Catholicism to the practical needs of the faithful." The result of this "practical" attitude of the Church is that she is continually losing her hold on the thoughtful element in society, while the scientific spirit, spread broadcast through magazines and newspapers, continues to make disciples at a rapidly increasing rate.

The problem must be met, Why does the Church continue to lose the intellectual portion of society, and why this underlying unrest which

no amount of "activity" can successfully cover? To answer these questions we must turn to the history of the Church.

Guignebert, in his *Christianity, Past and Present,* has pointed to the fact that the Church in its early history succeeded in assimilating the tendencies which it met in successive ages. When it came into contact with the mystery religions of the first century, it conquered them by taking their chief doctrine into its body. In the second century it won over Greek philosophy by utilizing the doctrine of the Logos to explain the incarnation of Christ. St. Augustine syncretized various tendencies in his day into his theology, which was to rule the thought of the Middle Ages. Even Scholasticism succeeded in utilizing the revival of classical philosophy in its theological system. It preserved for the thought of the Church a pliancy and plasticity which made further evolution of the Church possible. But the Council of Trent, Guignebert affirms, settled the destiny of the Roman Church. "She claimed to have defined the absolute truth in unalterable terms, and guaranteed not only the truth underlying her definition, but the very formula itself, with all the

authority of her infallibility." [1] Henceforth, there was no possibility of the Church's meeting the modern scientific spirit or adjusting herself to its claims. She was committed to Scholasticism as the infallible revelation of the mind of God. The Pope, whose infallibility had been proclaimed in 1870, was the Church and he acted in the spirit of the Council of Trent when he issued his Syllabus in 1907 condemning all Modernism. As a result, the Roman Church is in the position of being under obligation to maintain the dogmas of Scholasticism, while at the same time being confronted with the modern spirit of science, which is claiming an increasing number of her followers. To escape this embarrassing dilemma, she has directed her enthusiasm to a campaign of "activity." It can only be a temporary effort. "As far as it (Catholicism) is one of the definite forms of Christianity, its rôle seems to be virtually at an end in the world. Its heart is still red, but there is no more fuel and the fire is slowly expiring, the chill of death upon it." [2]

The Protestant Church confronts an equally

[1] P. 490. [2] P. 495.

trying problem. When Luther and his followers broke with the Roman Church, they took with them from Scholasticism all that had been vital to the thought of the period. They renounced the papacy and most of the ritual and ecclesiasticism of Rome, but they reaffirmed medieval dogma. Protestantism continued to proclaim the traditional conception of God, man and salvation. It differed chiefly in its emphasis on the methods by which this salvation was to be attained. While it denied the authority of the Church, it soon substituted the authority of the Bible and hence closed the door to free inquiry, which was rapidly becoming the spirit of modern culture. It was an authority which could not be enforced. The result was that Protestantism soon broke into a chaos of theological opinions and ritualistic abuses. With the exception of a comparatively small group of Modernists, Protestantism still clings to the infallibility of the Bible and closes the door to the method of science. Every effort it makes to effect a reunion of the Church only serves to emphasize its hopeless divisions, while the fight which the preponderating Fundamentalism makes against science,

whether in the realm of biology or historical criticism, and her bitterness against Modernism, reveals the fact that Protestantism is as hopelessly committed to Scholasticism as is the Church of Rome. Nothing could be a more searching comment on the state of religion in Protestantism than the fact that showmen, like Billy Sunday and, we might add, showwomen like Mrs. McPherson, represent an outstanding tendency in the Church of America, while over fifty per cent of the pulpits are occupied by illiterate ministers. Like Catholicism, the Protestant Church is making a mighty show of "activity." It is staging conferences and retreats. It floods her ministers with literature. It holds annual meetings to plan the conquest of the world. It is becoming a "seven day Church," with all sorts of clubs. But it has no doctrine which has been won out of its struggle with the modern world. It can have no such doctrine until it entirely relinquishes its doctrine of authority and repudiates Scholasticism. We do not see any sign that Protestantism as a whole will take this important step. We are inclined to affirm of Protestantism, as Guignebert did of Catholicism, "Logically, as well as

historically, it does not seem as if it will find any other fate than that which remains for us when we have used up our strength and filled up the number of our days—to break up and die, to return to Nature the elements lent by her, that she may use them again according to her good pleasure." [2]

The last hope of the Church is in Modernism, as its followers are struggling to bring religion into harmony with the scientific spirit. Whether they will succeed is a debatable question. Already the Church of Rome has been triumphant over Modernism within her ranks and has silenced the voice of her most profound scholars who sought to work a reform which would save the historic faith by bringing it into harmony with modern thought.

Modernism within the Protestant fold has not fulfilled the promise it gave the world a few years ago. The chief reason is that it has not yet created a dogma it can proclaim. The negative results of the Modernist have been important. He gave to the world the science of historical criticism which took men back of Scholasticism

[2] P. 507.

to the Christ of history. He has destroyed the dogma of the infallibility of the Church and the Bible. He has reconstructed the Bible by telling us how it was written. But the results of historical criticism leave us cold when we ask for a religion. Even the cry of "Back to Christ" has not served to supply our religious needs. Professor Whitehead wisely remarks, "It is a curious delusion that the rock upon which our belief can be founded is an historical investigation." We are not living in the first century of the Christian era; we cannot go backward. It is immaterial to us what Jesus taught, unless what he taught can be fitted into our world of the twentieth century. Before we can take him in earnest, we must be certain we live in a world where it is wise to take him in earnest. If we live in such a world as Nietzsche described, it may be logical to declare that Christianity is the most immoral blot upon our history. If this world is a blind machine, where things happen by chance, then why take any idealist in earnest? The period of historical criticism has served a valuable purpose in the development of religion, but it has not produced a generation of great

preachers, because it has given no creative philosophy to proclaim.

While the men of the religious schools have been pursuing their investigations in historical criticism, the men in the secular schools have been raising questions about our life and universe which involve the very existence of religion and for which a real answer must be found before religion will again grip the minds of the men of our century. Is this world a blind, chance mechanism, or does it have spiritual meaning? Is man part of the machine, or is he a living soul, superior to it? Is history the product of economic determinism, or are there values in it which are superior to the environment? Such questions as these are waiting for an answer before religion can again offer men a gospel of redemption or offer to them justification by faith. In the past men have looked to the Church for an answer to their vital questions. The Church has had few men trained to meet these questions in our generation. The scholars of religion have been so concerned to discover what occurred hundreds of years ago that they have given little attention to what is happening to-day. They have been

drilled in Old Testament and New Testament introduction and theology, but have given little thought to present day biology, physics and chemistry. As a result, multitudes are not even stopping to consult the Church to discover its opinions, but are passing it with a tantalizing indifference as they go to the leaders of the world of secular science and philosophy to learn what these leaders of thought have to say about the real problems of life. The historical critics are left to one side, twirling their thumbs, while men and women rush to purchase the newest book on religion which has been written by some man outside the Church who has had his training in some field of the sciences.

We should not forget that there are a few of the younger men, like Macintosh of Yale and Lyman of Union, who have faced heroically the real problems of religion, who have brought to them well trained intellects and who give promise of a better day in the schools of religion; but on the whole these schools have contributed little to the vital problems of religion in the last quarter of a century. The best work has been done by men outside the Church and it is to them we

must look for the foundations which are to bear the religious structure of the future.

If the Modernist is to speak to the religious needs of our day he must create an adequate dogma in harmony with modern tendencies. Every great age in religion has had to do this and our age will be no exception. If we have said anything about the higher critics which might be construed as unkind, we affirm that such has not been our purpose. These men have been necessary to our age of transition in religion and have done a valuable and heroic piece of work. There was much superstition that had to be cleared away from religion and much dogma which was proclaimed on the authority of the inspired word of God which could not justify its claim. But now that the work of the critics has been done, the question arises whether the Church can create an adequate metaphysics on which a new theology can be built and which will be a satisfying explanation of religious experience.

Albert C. Dieffenback, in his recently published book, *Religious Liberty,* utters a severe criticism against the Church, declaring that it has surrendered its search for truth and that the Funda-

mentalists are in possession in all the larger denominations. "To-day the Modernists in all the denominations have retired. Not a notable figure remains in the field. Their enemies have won the fight in every sector in Christendom. The movement to give us a liberated Church has bolted and collapsed." [4] We do not think the situation is quite as black as Mr. Dieffenback points out. Yet if we grant his contention, it does not follow that we are to accept his explanation of the cause of this disastrous retreat.

May it not be possible that the apparent quiescence of Modernism arises from the fact that it has not delivered to us all that it promised? What men want is a way of deliverance from individual and social sins, and Modernism has not pointed the way. It has cried "Back to Christ" to a world that is not inclined to go backward. It has fed us on a mass of critical conclusions about history, when men are asking for a living God. If Fundamentalism is entrenched in the Churches, it is only because men are reluctant to break away from old moorings until they are given something better. Modernism has

[4] P. 27.

failed to give us a Gospel to be preached. It is true that it has cleared the way for the creation of such a Gospel, destroying much of the "higher foolishness" that has accumulated about religion; but the day has come for the philosopher to build upon the critic and to create a message of good news for a generation that has been looking for bread and has been given a stone. The hope of the Church is neither in the Modernist nor the Fundamentalist, but in the man who can translate religious experience into the thought-forms of our day and through this language can fill the lives of men with a new hope.

This is not a task that can be accomplished in a short time. No man can enter his study and create a dogma which will meet our needs. Great dogmas have always been the result of the syncretizing of past experience with prevailing tendencies in religion, and the dogma that will sustain the Church of the future must come by the same process. What is urgent is to see that the present sickness of the Church is the lack of an adequate theology to proclaim, and for the scholars of the Church to set themselves to the task of meeting the spiritual needs of men by

giving to them an interpretation of our fundamental problems which will harmonize with their present culture. The following chapters are a humble attempt to suggest a possible solution of our religious thought and worship by an interpretation of Christian dogma in the light of emergent evolution.

CHAPTER II

EMERGENT EVOLUTION AND GOD

DESCARTES and Spinoza ushered in our modern period with the bold attempt to prove by the process of reason the reality of God, but these attempts only raised the question, Is reason reliable? When John Locke raised the inquiry concerning the nature of the understanding, he was destined to set the minds of men for generations into antagonistic camps which would end in a grand impasse in philosophy. On the one hand men were to end in utter skepticism concerning the ability of the understanding to know any ultimate reality, a skepticism which was born of Hume, and, on the other, the daring flights of Hegel, who claimed to know so much that his whole scheme ended in a creation of logic which had little reality left in it. Men grew tired of philosophy, feeling that it was a play with words and could never bring man to any abiding values.

The last days of this great period found Herbert Spencer playing with the Unknowable and lesser lights babbling over the relativity of all knowledge.

While the philosophers from Descartes to Hegel had been attempting to find ultimate reality through the processes of reason and had ended in intellectual bankruptcy, men of another bent of mind were seeking to know their world by the method of the laboratory. Their discoveries increased with such amazing rapidity and were utilized so easily to increase the physical comforts of humanity and to multiply the fruits of industry, that men turned to the new science as their great deliverer. The scientist took the place the philosopher had previously occupied and the gospel of science was widely proclaimed as having displaced the gospel of religion.

The battle cries were soon raised which resulted in the conflict between science and religion. It was a real life-and-death conflict. The present day preachers of Modernism who come to the defense of the scientist and who so loudly proclaim the doctrine of evolution, are frequently as oblivious of the real issue that was involved

in the battle as is the Fundamentalist. The truth is that if Neo-Darwinism had won the battle, the day of religion would have passed; and the further truth is that if a new day of hope has dawned for religion, it has not been won by the Modernist preachers or the Fundamentalists, but largely by the scientists and philosophers who have revealed the defects of Neo-Darwinism and have given us a conception of the universe on which the religionist can build a new and enduring structure.

The real issue was not the fact of evolution. It centered in the question of what the factors were which caused the world to evolve. While the press was making sensational news of man's supposed ascent from the monkey and while some preachers were raving in the pulpit about the attempt to relate man to the ape, the scientific world was calmly trying to answer the real question which affected not only the future of science but also of religion and, indeed, our whole conception of society and politics.

Lamarck had given an answer to this question which was in perfect keeping with religion. He had said that the evolution of life was the result

of environment and that the new characters acquired through its influence were transmitted to future generations. This left a place for religion as a part of the environment and for faith in God, who was the immanent creativeness in the process. But, on further investigation, the scientists came to doubt the doctrine of the transmission of acquired characteristics, and before many years passed they had come to reject the doctrine.

Darwinism was the most potent factor in this rejection of belief in acquired characteristics. Darwin affirmed that evolution was made possible by the law of natural selection. Those animals survived, according to his view, which were best adapted to their environment and this adaptation was made possible by small changes that occurred in the organism. These changes occurred purely by chance and enabled the animal to fit itself into this world of strife. It was natural that the religious folk did not like this theory and fought hard against it. They had not been trained to think of a universe that was carried forward by chance. They had always believed that there was a Providence in the world and to substitute

Chance for Providence was a blow to their religious feelings. But Science was in the saddle and in the name of the "Authority of Science" bishops were ridiculed and churchmen were treated as a group of men who belonged to the medieval ages and not to the nineteenth century.

Weismann drove the dagger further into the breast of religion, while unfriendly critics waited breathlessly for it to die. He not only set out to destroy the last vestige of Lamarck's doctrine of the transmission of acquired characteristics, but, by his investigation of Hydromedusæ, he formulated a theory of the germ plasm which made any transmission of acquired characteristics impossible. He attempted to show that if the fertilized ovum was divided, half going toward building the body and half being preserved for the germ plasm, there was no possibility of one half influencing the other. Environment might affect the body, but the germ plasm remained what it had been, without modification. Weismann gave this theory all the appearance of demonstration and placed behind it a fearful array of big-sounding scientific terms which captured the minds which were sworn to science.

We know now that much of Weismann's theory was based upon guesses rather than upon demonstration. Bertwig did complain that Weismann and his followers were "making a phantasmal image which, indeed, apparently may satisfy the craving for causality, but which eluded the control of concrete thought," and Driesch might attempt to show that the body plasm was not separated in the hard and fast way that was maintained by Weismann, but none of these men could stop the wild rush of speculation which was captivating the scientific minds of that day.

Materialism was ruling the day and Haeckel gave it a new impulse by his ability to present the subject in a way that could be understood. Embryology was brought into the limelight so that men could see that "every developing organism reproduced in its early development the characters of the stock from which it was descended." "Selection, operating on small variations, revealed the latent potentialities of the germ plasm, hewing out as the sculptor from the block of marble the imprisoned form, refining, perfecting, polishing, with a ruthless disregard of waste products. Line by line, phase by phase, the old was sac-

rificed to the new, and neither suffering nor aspiration could avail to check or hasten the process. Mechanical forces, operating universally, were fashioning creatures whose freedom was an illusion and whose fate was immutable. . . . We could only observe the process and submit to it, victims of a soulless automaton." [1]

This Neo-Darwinism was given dignity and standing by many illustrious names during the last thirty years of the nineteenth century and was carried into the fields of society and politics by men whose names have become familiar to the reading public. Religion was on the defensive or was regarded by multitudes as a lost cause. The universe had been reduced to a well regulated bit of mechanism, there was no place in it for God, and man was conceived as only a being who was part of the machine.

But in due time the pendulum began to swing in the other direction. The uncompromising mechanism of Weismann, Haeckel and their followers was severely shaken by scientists who showed that there was no such isolation between the body plasm and the germ plasm as these

[1] Raven: *The Creator Spirit,* p. 37.

giants had assumed. Dr. Adami, through years of patient investigation, proved that "among the bacteria acquired properties of certain orders are inherited through numerous generations." [2] Cunningham, Kammerer of Vienna, Durkhen of Breslau, and Pavlov of Petrograd made strong cases for inheritance of acquired characters and habits. Yule even went so far as to affirm, as a result of his experiments, that Mendelism was not a final explanation of the facts; that while the theory might be enough to guide the farmer, "it is inadequate completely to explain all the facts." [3] Professors Lloyd Morgan and H. F. Osborn bore their testimony against the adequacy of Neo-Darwinism. The bulwark of the soulless and mechanistic world at least began to totter, certainly to call for a modification of its descriptions.

As the years passed there came a reaction against the mechanistic theories of former years. Men felt that they were more than machines and that Chance was not the last place of refuge. Biologists had been gradually eating away the

[2] *Medical Contributions to the Study of Evolution,* p. 70.
[3] *Journal of Genetics,* Vol. XIII, pp. 255-331.

structure reared by Weismann and Haeckel, and people who confronted the difficult tasks of life could not feel that consciousness and personality, art, politics and religion could be crowded into the mechanical mold which made butter or fashioned cheese.

It was this reaction which in part accounts for the popularity of William James in the United States and Bergson in France. Here were two warriors who were fighting for a non-mechanical world, and the multitudes who had looked at the onslaughts of the materialists greeted them as saviors.

Philosophy began to come back in our world, not based on the old rationalism or idealism, but based on the fruits of the new science. Bergson, in the last decade of the last century, became the idol of all who were seeking for some relief from Neo-Darwinism. He refused to believe that this marvel of life was simply the play of physical and chemical forces. The whole life of the organism, as he conceived it, was greater than any of its parts. It was this surge of the life force, the *élan vital,* which was the fact of fundamental importance. In the lower form of animals

it remained captive in the mechanism of instincts it had set up, but in man it broke through the meshes of the net and gained its freedom. "Life appears in its entirety as an immense wave which, starting from the center, spreads outwards, and which on the whole of its circumference is stopped and converted into oscillation: at one single point the obstacle has been forced, the impulsion has been passed freely. . . . Everywhere but in man consciousness has had to come to a stand; in man alone it has kept on its way." [4]

While this philosophy of Bergson was welcomed by the theologians and proclaimed by preachers, its chief value lay in the fact that Neo-Darwinism had met a worthy antagonist who was sounding the death knell of bald materialism. He pictured this universe, especially life upon our globe, as things which could not be wholly explained by physical forces. It was too vast and complex an affair to be squeezed into the mold of purely mechanical forces. He brought God back into our world, not under the categories of the old theology, nor under the logical formulæ of Hegelianism, but as "increasing life, action,

[4] *Creative Evolution*, p. 266.

freedom. Creation is not a mystery; we experience it in ourselves when we act freely." [5]

Bergson did not utter a final word in philosophy. Much of his vitalism has been discarded in our day and his doctrine of intuition will not stand the test of modern psychology. But to him belongs the credit of being one of the warriors who stormed the castle of materialism and made its defenders hesitate.

While in England and Scotland the attack against materialism continued to follow in the main a form of modified Absolute Idealism, there were not wanting men of science who were storming the castle by the patient work of the laboratory. Haldane declared: "As a physiologist, I see no use for the hypothesis that life, as a whole, is a mechanical process. This theory does not help me in my work; and indeed I think it now hinders very seriously the progress of physiology. I should as soon go back to the mythology of our Saxon forefathers as to the mechanistic physiology." [6] A scientist like J. Arthur Thompson is equally outspoken against

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 248.
[6] *Mechanism, Life and Personality*, pp. 60-61.

the materialistic conception of life. He says: "There is much in the world which cannot be described in terms of matter and motion. The chemico-physical categories are insufficient. In animal behaviour and in evolution there are indubitable aspects of reality which transcend the laws of chemistry and physics." [7]

Rudolf Eucken is another name that must be added to the list of men who have made effective protests against the prevailing mechanistic and naturalistic philosophy of Neo-Darwinism. While he may have contributed very little toward a positive creative philosophy, he must not be forgotten as a critic of prevailing tendencies in thought. He saw clearly the failure of the older Christian theology to deal adequately with our modern world. The conception of the world held by the older forms of Christianity had become absolutely untenable. Its whole attitude toward life was conceived in too limited a fashion to meet the movements of modern life because "the older form of Christianity was the product of an exhausted and faint-spirited age; hence its fundamental attitude is predominantly passive and neg-

[7] *Science and Religion*, p. 162.

ative." [8] But if Christianity in its prevailing intellectual forms was inadequate to meet the needs of our modern world, no less did the prevailing naturalism fail to answer the questions which were forced upon us. Naturalism had failed to give a satisfying account of man. "Even the most zealous champion of the claims of nature cannot deny that man achieves something distinctive: we not only belong to nature, we also have knowledge of the fact; and this knowledge is in itself sufficient to show that we are more than nature." [9] When we pass from the individual to history, or the relation of individuals in society, we cannot account for it by purely mechanical causes. If history is nothing other than the product of strife, it is difficult to see how history could have made any progress. History to progress must evolve something new and this is what it actually does. "Spiritual history would be impossible unless there is active within us from the beginning an independent spiritual life which first realizes its content through the historical process." [10]

[8] *Life's Basis and Life's Ideal*, p. 334.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 114. [10] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

Out of these numerous protests against the materialism of Neo-Darwinism, there has arisen a group of men who have suggested a possible philosophy of nature which bids fair to open a foundation upon which a new theology may be built. Alexander, in his monumental work, *Space, Time and Deity,* has done the work of a hardy pioneer and he has been followed by others, among whom Morgan, in his *Emergent Evolution* and *Life, Mind and Spirit,* is the most rewarding for the religious mind. We may acknowledge that these men have only made the first clearings in a new frontier, but they have the merit of opening to us a new heaven and a new earth which contain promise for the future.

Before we are in a position to understand "Emergent Evolution," we must recall the dualistic conception of the world which was the foundation of traditional theology of the Church and was the background of much European philosophy. Theologians had made a sharp distinction between the natural and the supernatural, the divine and the human, the body of man and his soul. The primitive man had built his mythology from this uncompromising dualism. He had

come to believe in the reality of soul through the influence of his dreams. The soul of his departed loved one had returned to him in his dreams, which was evidence that the soul may leave the body and yet retain its identity. When he attempted to explain man he naturally thought of him as a body which imprisoned a living spirit and from which the spirit could go and to which it could return. The same dualism guided his thought of God. The earth was the dwelling place of Deity, but Deity was a disembodied Spirit separated from the world. He came into it by special intervention. When he wanted to make himself known he wrought a miracle, he parted the waters of the sea, he sent manna down from heaven.

While advancing culture refined this primitive conception of the world, gave to it a metaphysical background and became the foundation of learned systems of theology, it was never anything more than the thought of primitive man adorned. Its roots were all in primitive mythology. The God of this thought was a discarnate Spirit. He had to create a world out of nothing and reveal himself by breaking through the nat-

ural realm in miracle. It was this primitive mythology which had ruled the Western world in the organized power of the Church through the Christian centuries to the advent of modern science.

The battle between science and religion began when science discovered that we did not need the hypothesis of a discarnate Spirit to account for the processes of nature. Nearly forty years ago, LeConte, professor and geologist at the University of California, summarized the results of natural science in his famous definition of evolution: "Evolution is continuous progressive change, according to certain laws and by means of resident forces." [11] The last phrase, "by means of resident forces," sounded the death knell of primitive mythology. The scientist no longer needed a God outside of nature to account for its development. Nature was a cosmos within which were to be found the forces which were to account for its development. Man, even including his mind, was a part of this cosmos. He had developed out of it, and the biologist, the chemist and the physicist were busy in their laboratories discovering the

[11] *Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought*, p. 8.

"resident forces" by which man had come to be what he is. No scientist felt the need of any outside agency to help him in his work. He found no evidence for the operation of any such absentee Deity in his investigations and he went his way without the assumption of the existence of such a God.

Since the days of LeConte, this attitude on the part of the scientist has become universal. No scientist of our day would think of taking mythology into his laboratory to help him. He can get along without it. Indeed, it would be a hindrance to his work.

Morgan in his *Emergent Evolution* is outspoken against the dualistic conception of the world. "My concept of the spiritual is avowedly monistic to the core. Mythology is avowedly pluralistic in a disparate realm of being." [12] He does not find God outside of the world but in it. "I hold this world-plan is a manifestation of Divine Purpose." [13] "The world-plan, through and through, from its lowest to its highest expression, is manifestation of God; in you and me, in each of us severally, God as Spirit is partially revealed.

[12] *Life, Mind and Spirit*, p. 11. [13] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

This revelation is only partial, since each of us is only an individual instance of that which in full manifestation is universal." [14] He knows no such world as the supernatural. If it exists, it is beyond our knowledge and, hence, our attitude toward it must be agnostic. We know only one realm, that of our natural world, which reports itself to our senses and which we may study in the laboratory. This realm of nature is, through and through, monistic. There are not two realms existing in exclusion of each other or even interlocking. Everything that is belongs to the one realm and everything is a manifestation of it. Thus, in his mind, which is the mind of the scientific world, primitive mythology gives way to naturalism of a thorough-going monistic type.

In such a world is there a place for Deity? Morgan affirms that there is and devotes two volumes, *Emergent Evolution* and *Life, Mind and Spirit,* to an exposition of his faith.

While Morgan proceeds upon the basis of a monistic naturalism, it must not be concluded that he holds to the mechanistic world of Neo-Darwinism. He frankly says that "the whole doc-

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 32.

trine of emergence is a continual protest against mechanical interpretation and the very antithesis to one that is mechanistic. It does not interpret life in terms of physics and chemistry." [15] The essential feature of the mechanistic interpretation is that "it is in terms of resultant effects only, calculable by algebraical summation. It ignores something more that must be accepted as emergent." There are resultant effects in the development of the world, but there is emergence also and it is this emergence of something new which requires us to think of our world in terms of something more than a mechanism.

We must grasp Morgan's idea of the evolving world before we are able to understand his protest against the mechanistic view. He asks us to start by taking everything out of our world that has been put in it. Think of a world without a living being, without tree or moss or lichen, without the earth, moon or stars. Then we have left to the imagination only an "inexpungable remainder with naught beyond spatio-temporal terms in fluent relations of like order." [16] Out of this world with nothing in it except "point-instants"

[15] *Emergent Evolution*, p. 7. [16] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

all things are to come. Matter emerges out of this world. Then matter takes form and out of the world of matter comes life. The long ascending forms of life emerge until mind is born, with reason, reflection and the capacity to enjoy the fruits of reflection.

Morgan presents his conception in the form of a diagram.



The base of the pyramid is space-time (S. T.) Within the pyramid we may conceive a number of smaller pyramids, each representing the emergence of a new entity. At the base we have "atom-pyramids," then molecules, "yet higher 'things' (e.g. crystals), higher still plants (in which mind is not yet emergent), then animals (with consciousness), and, near the top, our human selves." [17] Through the whole pyramid is a nisus toward Deity which finally culminates in

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

people who have a religious sense of Deity in the whole process.

The first significant implication of this pyramid for religion is that it belongs to one process. It is all within the realm of naturalism and whatever spiritual reality exists is found within this process. Nothing comes into it from the outside. There is no place for a supernatural, if by this term we mean an alien influence, which must be introduced to explain the development of the pyramid. Everything that is, even God, if we are to affirm his existence, must be within the world that we know.

The second important implication for religion is that development which takes place within the pyramid is more than a mechanical process. The atoms enter into the molecule. If this were all, the molecule might be considered the product of the mechanical combining of the atoms. But the molecule is more than the atoms which enter into it. It is something new in itself. It possesses qualities which the atom does not possess. The molecule is a new entity which is more than anything that went before it. In the same manner the molecules combine to produce "things," say a

crystal. This crystal holds within it the sum of all the molecules which entered into it. It contains new qualities which never existed in the molecule. Let us assume that the molecules combined to produce life. The physico-chemical processes have succeeded in producing a thing that lives, a single cell of life. The energies of mother earth have so combined that there emerges a vital entity which was to give a new significance to our world, but this life was also a *new* thing. There arose an entity which "justifies a valid distinction between the living and the lifeless." There is still nothing that gives evidence of conscious direction, but something that was forever to be distinguished from all that had preceded it.

Out of this simple, unconscious life came mind. The lower forms of life had been characterized simply by "behavior." They acted in response to stimuli from the environment, without any conscious guidance. This lower form of life entered, let us say, into the bird. All the past life of preceding forms had entered into the making of that bird—the reptile world which had immediately preceded it, the lower forms, even down to the single cell of life. But when the bird emerged,

it was more than anything which had gone before it. It possessed physical characteristics which were wholly new and a mind which could profit by experience. While we must be on our guard against attributing to it reflection or acting with any immediate end in view, it yet possessed a mental power which all that had gone before it never enjoyed.

The same principle holds through the emergence of all the higher forms of life. The whole past of the living world enters into the making of man. The embryologist traces, in the embryo in the womb of the mother, the development of the child through all the stages of animal life before man. But with the birth of man a new creation comes upon the earth, a creature with reason, reflection, enjoyment of the fruits of reflection, and a spiritual life in some men by which they are conscious of God.

The important thing about this conception of evolution is that one thing did not develop into the next higher thing and so on up through the ascending scale. Morgan emphatically declares: "We are not to suppose that an atom develops into a molecule, this into a plastidule (or what-

ever it may be called on the level of life), and so on. Each higher entity in the ascending series is an emerging complex of many entities of lower grades, within which a new kind of relatedness gives integral unity." [18] This is a new emphasis in the theory of evolution. Herbert Spencer hinted at it in his "Biology" and J. S. Mill suggested it in his writings, but it was left for Morgan and kindred minds of our day to show that evolution was more than a process that could be described by mathematical addition which made the number four to be the sum of the four preceding units which had entered into it. Every emerging entity was the product of all the past that had entered into it plus the new qualities which were more than the result of the combination of that past in a new form.

It is this last element in emergent evolution which gives us a conception of a world which is more than mechanical. There is a nisus running through the whole pyramid, by the power of which new emergents emerge. This does not mean that some alien power exists outside of the process. This is just the idea which the pyramid is intended

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

to exclude. All "alien influx into nature is barred." The divine Activity is "omnipresent and manifested in every one of the multitudinous entities within the pyramid. God, if in any, is in all, without distinction of the entities." [19]

While this conception of evolution in terms of a religious rather than a mechanical interpretation of our world culminates in a consciousness of Deity in the lives of spiritually minded men, Deity being the top of the pyramid, it also assumes that Deity to some degree also expresses itself in every one of the lesser pyramids which enter into the whole. The emergence of each new entity along the way is an emergence of Deity at that level. The crystal is the emergence of Deity at the crystal level. When life emerges, Deity comes into our world at a higher level. It is not until we reach the emergence of mind, reflection and spirituality that Deity emerges into our world as the God who meets our human needs. We do not know what Agency may be back of our world process. The questions of a First Cause, of an Absolute, belong to the unknowable. To speculate about them is unprofitable, because they

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

belong to a realm where we come to the end of our intellectual tether. We know Deity only as it emerges out of the making of a world, including things and life. To the atom Deity appears as that which emerges next above it in the molecule. To the animal, Deity is that Creativeness which is pulling him onward to a higher creation, in the complexity of his individual and social worlds.

When Morgan affirms that Deity residing in the process is the power by which emergents emerge and that the whole scheme of emergent evolution is a manifestation of Divine Directive Purpose, it may be urged that this is pure assumption, for which we have no evidence. It may be affirmed that we know the physical scheme of things, but not the spiritual world. Morgan meets this objection by the assertion that when we consider these fundamental questions, we have no evidence that amounts to demonstration. In both cases we are moving in the realm of faith. Both the world and God are beyond absolute knowledge. They are questions which must be answered by experience. He replies to the materialists: "I acknowledge a physical world which,

I admit, is beyond proof. I acknowledge also God, Who is, I contend, beyond disproof. And so far as I can judge, both acknowledgments work. There is pragmatic endorsement of that which is offered for credal acceptance. Of the former, Mr. Russell says that it is justified practically by the amplification it introduces into the laws of physics. Can it be denied that the acknowledgment of God, which is the heart and soul of Christianity, has been profoundly influential in the practical guidance of conduct?" [20] The assumption of a physical world works in the realm of chemistry and physics. It has made possible the building of a consistent world of physical science. But the acknowledgment of God has also worked as the Activity "who draws all things and all men upwards."

Morgan makes a very important distinction between life, mind and spirit, which must not be overlooked in the development of his scheme of evolution. He distinguishes both life and mind from spirit. "I regard life and mind as manifestations of spirit in an ascending hierarchy of such manifestations. This brings them within the

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

orbit of natural events to be interpreted subject to methods of naturalism. In accordance with this view, spirit is not a *quality* at the summit of the evolutionary hierarchy. It is that of which *all* qualities, from lowest to highest, are manifestations under the conditions of time and space." [21] This position frees him from all conceptions of a supernatural or alien influx into nature. Our world becomes a scheme which may be studied on the basis of naturalism. The physicist gives himself to the study of one phase of this scheme, the chemist another, the psychologist another. Life and mind may be studied as a part of this scheme by the methods of the naturalist. But no one of these specialists gives us the picture of the whole. It remains for the philosophers to see the various phases of naturalism as a manifestation of Spirit, that which gives unity to the whole, and of which nature in its many phases is a manifestation. Apart from God "that which we call nature would have neither being nor evolutionary becoming." [22] The whole plan of nature is a manifestation of Divine Pur-

[21] *Life, Mind and Spirit,* p. 1.
[22] *Ibid.,* p. 34.

pose to be studied by the method of the naturalist.

This conception of *all* nature as a manifestation of Spirit involves the idea of all nature as including the activity of God throughout the whole evolutionary process. But we must guard against thinking of this Activity as something outside of the natural processes. "It is that Activity which is manifested in *all* action—in that which obtains in the atom as in that which obtains in man, each according to its status. If it be said that such a monistic concept of Activity, universally but differentially manifested throughout nature, belittles man and dethrones him from his high estate, I cannot agree. But I am more concerned to give to Divine Purpose its due—to enthrone God rather than to dethrone man. If in some slight measure Divine Purpose be enthroned in and through me, I am thankful and claim no more." [28]

This conception of evolutionary naturalism opens a new outlook for religion. First, it offers a way of escape from the materialistic and mechanistic teaching of Neo-Darwinism, which has threatened religion for the last half century,

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 287-288.

while at the same time it preserves the naturalism on which science rests. The emphasis in most writings on evolution has been upon development of one entity out of another. We have often felt, as we have read these books, the drag of the past upon us to such an extent that we forgot the pull of the future that was ahead of us. Man has been treated so exclusively in the light of what he came from that we have frequently been blinded to the fact that man *is*, with all those divine qualities which are more than his past. Emergent evolution does not overlook the *stuff* which has entered into the making of man, but it reminds us that in addition to the stuff that has entered into his creation, there has also emerged a new substance which is more than the sum of stuff. The atoms are the "stuff" which enter into the molecule, but the molecule is a new substance which is more than the sum of the stuff. So the whole past of the physical and animal world is the stuff that has entered into man, but man is a new substance which is more than the sum of the past. It is this fact which makes our world more than a mechanism. The world has been a succession of new emergents which have been more than the

result of the mechanical combining of antecedent elements.

Second, this whole scheme of emergent evolution has a "go" to it which is far more than the chance world of Neo-Darwinism. This involves far more than the fact that evolution as a whole indicates that the process has been "going" somewhere. There has been a "go" within the process itself. Each entity within the ascending scale of entities has something which suggests Activity, something which has made each ascending pyramid different in substance from those which entered as stuff into it.

Third, it is possible to take two attitudes toward the question, What is the power by which these emergents emerge? One may be the attitude of the agnostic. He refuses to affirm or deny what this power may be. He prefers to go about his work in the laboratory without asking any ultimate question. On the other hand, other men may not be content to rest in agnosticism. Realizing that the scheme of evolution is more than mechanistic and that there is a "go" within the plan, they must ask what it is of which the whole plan is a manifestation. When one seeks for an

answer to the question of causality, he finds himself not only part of the whole plan, but he finds spiritual life within himself which becomes the key by which he unlocks the mystery which runs through the whole. "Unless we intuitively enjoy His Activity within us, feeling that we are in a measure one with Him in Substance, we can have no immediate knowledge of Causality or of God as the Source of our own existence and of emergent evolution." [24] Thus, from our own spiritual experience, we find our answer to the question concerning the nature of that by which the world "goes."

What is missed by many sincere, religious people in this conception of emergent evolution, with its concomitant faith in Divine Purpose, is a God who is more than the process and who is transcendent. Men who have worshiped the God of their fathers have stood in the presence of what they conceived as ineffable glory and have cried, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God Almighty." To such people Morgan seems to lose God in nature. Indeed, what he calls God may at times seem to be a deification of nature.

[24] *Emergent Evolution*, p. 301.

They ask for a God who is transcendent as well as immanent. A God who is immanent may serve art and science, but the soul that is sick, that is conscious of sin and seeks a way of escape, that is crushed by sorrow and asks a Comforter, wants a God who is objectively real, who is more than we are and who has sufficient power to redeem. It is a demand for a God which the evolutionary naturalists do not appear to give, a demand which is based upon the argument from the needs of mankind. That men need such a God is tragically evident from the cries of men through the ages, as they have sought support and help in their hours of weakness and distress. The question arises, Does emergent evolution, with its conception of God, supply this human need?

This question cannot be fully answered until we come to our conception of Christ as Deity and Redeemer, but we must here give consideration to the subject of the objectivity of God in the monistic conception of the universe, which we have set forth in previous pages.

What we designate transcendence and immanence in theology are only big words for identity and difference. But these words come to have a

change of meaning in our monistic scheme from what they had in a world which grew out of primitive mythology. In this mythology God was not identified with his world, but was different from it. He was a discarnate Spirit who was above his world and different from man in substance. Even when mythology was smoothed down and adorned by later philosophy and theology, the difference in transcendence meant that God was in some sense outside of his world. Modern science and philosophy cannot admit the existence of such a God, as it knows no other world in which a God can exist. To speak of one universe, the only one we can know, and at the same time of a God who is more than and above this universe, is to attempt to bring together two disparate realms, which cannot be done by any monistic thought. There can be no transcendence of God in a sense that there is a God beyond the universe we know. Any attempt to trim down the meaning of this word "transcendence," which is constantly being attempted, is to rob the word of any traditional significance.

But, because we cannot allow the transcendence of God in the traditional sense of the

word, this does not mean that God has no objectivity for the individual. The rose has objectivity for us, though it is part of nature and within the world we know. We may speak of it as "within the system," yet it also lies beyond us and serves all needs of our admiration for the beautiful and creation of esthetics. In like manner the evolutionary naturalist must speak of all things, including God and man, as "within the system," but this does not destroy the objectivity of God for the religious needs of mankind. So far as any individual is concerned, God is not only the Activity within his life, but he is also the Activity above and beyond the individual. He is the Activity in the whole realm of the natural universe and hence the object of reverence and adoration.

S. Alexander, who affirms that his conception of God is theistic rather than pantheistic, defines God as body and soul, but it is his soul that is Deity. The whole physical frame of the evolving universe is God's body, but the emergence of Deity has transcended the body and in its moral and spiritual aspects becomes the God we worship. His soul has transcended all other finite qualities,

becoming the creative activity which ever lures us forward to a better to-morrow and the God with whom the religious soul finds fellowship. God remains within the world but is more than any finite part of the world. He is both body and soul and thus is at once immanent and transcendent. His body is immanent in the world, while his Deity is beyond or transcendent over any individual part of it.

While this picture of God with a body and a soul may smack of early Greek thought over which fierce battles were fought and, which it must be admitted, contains an element of offense to those trained in traditional Christian thought, it nevertheless holds an advantage over the conflicting parties to immanence and transcendence. These two schools of thought have usually divided into the opposing schools of theism and pantheism. They have emphasized one or the other tendency to the exclusion of the opposite. While emergent evolution may not satisfy either school, it comes nearer to a solution of the old question. This physical universe may truly be conceived as the body of God, in which he is immanent, and yet the present outcome of the evolutionary proc-

ess gives us emergent Deity, which is more than any part of the scheme and which supplies the religious needs of the man who reaches forward to something better.

What man is really seeking in his conception of the transcendence of God is a power adequate to meet his needs. He has affirmed the transcendence of God because he wanted to believe in his omnipotence. He has believed that unless he had an omnipotent God, he did not possess a God who was adequate to human needs. But, as a matter of history, men, unless we except Calvinism, have never had an omnipotent God. The God of Christians is limited both by the free will of man and by sin. The omnipotence of God was limited in the Garden of Eden and the Church has never offered a God who had adequate power to more than meet human needs, including sin and suffering. The men who affirm an all-powerful God are erecting a straw-God who never existed.

No man of science can affirm a God who can do whatever he wants to do. The God of emergent evolution not only exists "within the system," but he is limited by the laws according to which

the system operates. God cannot make a two year old calf to be a yearling nor can he make a dog to be a cat. The value of God for the religious soul must be found in the moral and spiritual values which have emerged from the ascending levels of life, and only as man finds fellowship with God through these values does he find power to reconstruct his own life and that of society. But within these values, if man would recognize them and apply them, he would find adequate help for all human needs, even to the need of building the Kingdom of God on the earth. In this sense God becomes transcendent, not that he is a discarnate Spirit existing in some alien realm, but that he becomes the God of present moral and spiritual values who recreates man into his likeness.

CHAPTER III

EMERGENT EVOLUTION AND THE DEITY OF CHRIST

We have given a brief and inadequate sketch of the doctrine of emergent evolution. Perhaps enough has been given to indicate its essential features. Readers who desire to know more about it may turn to Morgan, who has devoted two carefully written volumes to the subject. We now turn to the question, What place shall we give to Christ in this world of emergents?

The traditional conceptions of Christ will be carried forward for several generations by the powerful organization of the Roman Church and by the emotional appeals of the Fundamentalists, but no tradition can continue indefinitely which has had the intellectual basis cut from beneath it. The Modernist may also succeed for a time in his cry of "Back to Christ." But this cry of the Modernist either goes back of Christianity into

Judaism or else reduces Jesus to a simple teacher of moral precepts. In the former, Christianity is completely destroyed and Judaism is substituted in its place; and in the latter, Jesus inevitably becomes one great teacher among many others who have appeared in different ages. In either case Modernism not only destroys the uniqueness of Jesus, but his Deity.

The orthodox conception of Christ did not originate from the Jewish but from the Greek world. The problem which was bequeathed to the Greeks through their philosophers was how to bring God and the world, God and man, together. This was a problem which Plato had left unsolved. His God was above the world, the world being conceived as evil. How could a perfect God and an evil world be brought into active coöperation? Plato had no satisfactory answer. Aristotle removed God even further from the world. His God was a First Mover who set the world going, but, after it was once in movement, it seemed to get along very well without God. The Stoics tried to solve the problem by making God the All, but in their pantheism they lost God for the religious needs of man.

They felt this lack and created the idea of the Logos, or Divine Reason, as an emanation from God who stood as an intermediary between God and the world, the Creator of the world and the revealer of truth through mankind.

The early Christians were not philosophers. The Greek method of speculation was foreign to their life. They had lived with the Christ and after his death they believed that he had come back to them. They gave no philosophical explanation of the fact, but were conscious of it as a precious experience. God, through Christ, had come into their lives, enabling them to put off the old life and take on the new life of righteousness. They were careless in the use of words by which they explained this experience. The "Holy Spirit," the "Spirit of God," the "Spirit of Christ," were words they used to describe the fact that Deity had come into their lives, raising them from the dead and giving them a new life in Christ Jesus. We need not concern ourselves over questions of exigesis. It is enough for us to observe that through experience they had solved the old questions that had disturbed the Greek mind. God had come into their lives through

their fellowship with the living Christ and had made them conquerors over the world, the flesh and the devil.

Scholarship is making it clear that as these early Christians tried to explain this experience, as they carried their religion outside of Palestine, they were influenced by many religious movements of their day. It is now clear that, as a result of their contacts with other cultures, Christianity early became a composite of many religious ideas, which were absorbed from the worlds in which Christianity moved. But the important fact for the future of the Church is that this Christianity, as experience of Deity in humanity through Christ, ultimately became the possession of men who were also thoroughly steeped in Greek philosophy. This meeting place was Alexandria. There Justin Martyr, Clement and Origen were teachers in the Church. They knew the blessed experience of Deity in their lives which had come to them through Christ. But how could they rationalize that experience for the Greek world? That was the question which confronted them. The method was already at hand. The Greek had his conception of the Logos as the mediator between God

and man. These Greek Christians saw the way to harmonize Christian experience and philosophy. Christ was the Logos. Through him Deity had come into our world. He was the mediator between the transcendent and ineffable God on the one side, and men hungering for God on the other. Christ was the Eternal Logos who had dwelt in the Greeks, giving them Greek wisdom, as he had also dwelt in Moses and the prophets. The law and philosophy were only parts of a whole which had been preparing the way for the coming of God into history in the Christ of Palestine.

The Christian doctrine of the Trinity, which has been so abused, sometimes reduced to a mere mathematical puzzle of how three could be one, and which has more frequently been presented in the form of three Gods, grew out of this explanation of Christian experience in terms of the Logos doctrine of the Greeks. The form in which this doctrine finally found expression is foreign to our ways of thinking. We no longer think in terms of the Logos philosophy. But the problem which it attempted to answer remains as vital to us as it was in those far away days, namely, How

can Deity dwell in our humanity as Creator, Revealer and Redeemer?

Our approach to this question can no longer be through the orthodox creed which was a combination of Greek philosophy and Christian experience. It was based upon a dualism of God and the world which is inadmissible in our conception of emergent evolution. It presents Christ as coming into the world from the outside and there is no outside to our conception of the order of nature. We have seen that we must regard God as immanent in the scheme of nature and transcendent to it only in the sense that he is more than any part of it and that as the Whole he is objective to the individual.

Not only was the dogma of the Deity of Christ clothed in the Greek doctrine of the Logos, a philosophy which no longer has standing in our world, but the Greeks and Romans, who formulated this dogma, were guided by a dualism between the human and divine natures. They assumed that there was a fundamental difference between the human and the divine. Hence, when they attempted to show how Jesus was the union of God and man, they could only do it by assum-

ing that Jesus had two natures, one divine and the other human. Not only has this always been a difficult doctrine for the Church to maintain, but there was always the danger of men emphasizing one phase of Christ's nature to the exclusion of the other, hence of being led into heresy. Because Christ was conceived as a being with two natures, those who exalted his Deity were tempted to forget his human nature, and those who emphasized his human life were frequently led to deny his Deity.

This was the real basis of the controversy that resulted in the Unitarian movement in New England. The leaders of this movement attacked the traditional doctrine of the two natures and asserted that Christ had only one nature, the human.

The modern doctrine of the immanence of God cut away the foundation of the ancient controversy and left both Orthodoxy and Unitarianism stranded by the way. When the immanence of God was accepted, it was no longer possible to believe that the divine and the human were unlike in substance. As McGiffert says: "By traditional Christianity man was thought of as totally

depraved and corrupt, the opposite in every sense of the divine. To be human was to be undivine and to be divine was to be unhuman. Where divine immanence is believed in, man is recognized as himself divine. His nature is one with God's and not other than it."

This new attitude toward man was bound to transform our conception of Christ. When man is conceived as divine, his nature one with God's, then the divine is found in the human and the human is divine. Thus it is not necessary to assume that Christ had two natures. The divine is found in his human life, and through his human life he reveals the Deity that is immanent in the world.

Both Schleiermacher and Ritschl had a share in the development of this idea of Christ. The former taught that Christ's Deity consisted in his consciousness of his oneness with God. Essentially, Christ was no more divine than we are, but he was more conscious of it, and it was this consciousness of his oneness with God that awakens in us a sense of our oneness with God and, hence, through this fact, he enables us to overcome sin and live a divine life. Schleier-

macher rejected all external means of salvation, like expiation and sacrifice, and emphasized the inward and moral aspects of it. We are saved, he affirmed, only as we become conscious of the divine within us and Christ becomes our Savior because he awakens within us this divine consciousness.

Ritschl entirely abandoned the old conception of divine substance which was held by the Greeks, which was a purely metaphysical idea, and found his interpretation of the Deity of Christ in his ethical value. Christ has for us "the value of God." When we commune with Christ, we are communing with the highest purpose we know anything about. Hence, "the Deity of Christ resides in his knowledge of the divine purpose and its mediation to us." The whole question of Christ's birth and his preëxistence is of no value, Ritschl maintained. The only mark of Christ's oneness with God that can have any significance for us is his unity of will, sympathy and purpose with God. The Deity of Christ lies wholly in the ethical sphere rather than in the metaphysical. Christ becomes our Savior by revealing to us the moral purpose of God and by awakening within us

the desire to accomplish God's purpose on the earth.

Thus, when we say that we find Deity in the humanity of Jesus, we must be prepared to rid our minds entirely of the traditional conception of Christ with two natures in one personality. This conception of Christ belongs to a metaphysical idea of God and man, which is foreign to our age. Whatever Deity we find must be discovered within our human world. Jesus is not Deity because he came from the outside of our world and took up his abode in the form of a man. He is the revelation of Deity through the human because he sought the highest values of goodness and beauty and love and was triumphant in his quest, and because he was triumphant he awakens in us the consciousness that we, too, are divine, and hence he brings us into union with God.

This conception of man and of Christ is in harmony with our scientific doctrine of continuity. We have seen that neither our science nor our philosophy can admit of any supernatural power which exists outside of our world and is injected into it. Whatever creativeness there is

in the development of life must reside in the process. It is equally true that whatever came out of the process must have been conditioned by what immediately preceded it. This does not mean the old doctrine, applied to the spiritual world, that water cannot rise higher than its source, that nothing came out of the process which did not reside there in the beginning. The doctrine of emergence involves two factors. There must be a qualitative resemblance between the new emergent and the thing which preceded it, but there is also something entirely new in what emerges. There are qualities in the bird which belong to the reptile, but there are also new qualities in the bird which are unlike those found in the reptile. So there are qualities in man which are like unto the animal world which immediately precedes man, but there are also new qualities, like consciousness, the love of the beautiful and the sense of the good and the religious consciousness, which are unlike anything that has gone before them. But this does not mean that these new things were injected into the process from the outside. They are the fruit of continuity and are the creation of forces which reside in the process itself.

It is this point of view which renders it impossible for us to make the old distinction between the human and the divine natures which was made by the framers of the orthodox doctrine of the incarnation. We cannot think of Christ as a Deity outside of the world, which was unlike the human in substance and that came into the world for a few brief years to reside in a human form. Whatever there was in Christ was the fruit of the developing process of which he was a part. He belonged to our humanity and whatever there was in him of Deity was the expression of that which resided in the creativeness of the natural process.

Neither can we admit that the appearance of Christ was a sudden break in the continuity of nature. He came not to destroy but to fulfill. Biblical study has made it clear that he was the spiritual heir of the ages. There was not a single truth he announced which did not find its roots in the past history of his nation, and his body was the seed of David. Mentally and physically, he was the fruit of what had gone before him. There was no more a break between him and the past than there was between the men of his day and the past history of Israel.

But this does not imply that there was nothing new in him. Indeed, the birth of every great soul has brought something new into the world which has taken the race upward on its journey. While Jesus was the fruit of the past, the thing that was new in him was the richness of his religious consciousness, which seized upon Deity that had been in the past, was vital to the present, and that pointed toward the establishment of the kingdom of love and goodness in the future. He was at one in his consciousness with Deity in the world and as such awakened in men a consciousness of Deity that was in them and sent them forth to establish the reign of God among men.

It must be evident that Deity, as we have defined it, did not come into the world for the first time with the coming of Christ. Deity had been in the processes of growth through the ages. Whether there was any Deity in the world when it was in its physio-chemical stage is a question which belongs entirely to the realm of metaphysics. There may have been purpose in the physio-chemical activity, as Henderson maintains, preparing the physical world for the advent of life. This is a question on which there is a differ-

ence of opinion and must not be asserted dogmatically until we learn more from physics and chemistry about the primeval process. At least we can only assume it as a hypothesis, but we must not assert it as proven.

We have seen, however, that when we reach the world of living things, there are at least elements out of which Deity emerged, the elements of coöperation and service and sacrifice. When we reach the lower human sphere there emerges in much clearer form the struggle for the survival of others, the elements of good-will and love and sacrifice. Deity is in conflict with bestiality in the heart of every human mother, in the community life of the tribe, and in every man who feels the lure of the ideal. The old fighting instinct of the brute world is still largely dominant, but Deity is also present, struggling for its emergence in the better home, the larger coöperative community and the higher idealism of life. Deity grows and the beast becomes less, as men pass from savagery to barbarism and from barbarism to civilization. The God who takes delight in the killing of men, women and children, gives way to the God who expresses himself through justice

and mercy, and finally becomes the God of the whole world, who asks men to live in righteousness, to do justly, to show mercy, to visit the fatherless and the widow. The emergence of Deity over bestiality covers many hundred thousands of years, but with the coming of each generation Deity becomes more powerful in our humanity and bestiality becomes less. Deity becomes increasingly the element that makes life a thing of value and society a creative agent which is working toward a world of coöperation.

If the objection is raised that this conception of Deity reduces God to moral and social values, we reply that it is in the realm of such values that men in the future will look for God. It is not an easy transition for us to make. We are still closely related to the primitive mind which conceived of God as power and thought of him as working through magic. For most men miracle is still a greater evidence of God than love, and they are much more ready to discover him in some unusual catastrophe than they are to find him in the orderly working of his world. But men in their science and their sociology have passed out of the primitive mind and they must

also pass out of it in the realm of religion. Men who have ceased to find their science in the realm of magic cannot find their religion in magic. Ellwood has defined religion as "a belief in the reality of spiritual values," [1] and certainly no conception of religion less than this can satisfy the mind of our day. God can only be conceived as the manifestation of ideal values that have emerged in our human world and are the creative values that are making a better world for to-morrow.

The question now arises, Did Deity emerge in its highest and completest manifestation in the man Jesus? There is nothing in the conception of emergent evolution to preclude this conclusion. Morgan says: "It seems, as I think on the evidence, that the higher we ascend in the hierarchy, the emergent complexity is such that it appears justifiable to say that no two persons are quite alike. Each person is a uniquely individual product along one of very many lines of advance—say Shakespeare, Goethe, Newton and Darwin. If this be so, the nisus toward Deity, on its strictly central line, should culminate in one unique person, at the very apex of the period. If an impar-

[1] *Reconstruction of Religion,* p. 45.

tial historical survey should lead to the conclusion that the nisus toward Deity had culminated in one unique individual, there is, so far as I can see, nothing in the naturalistic interpretation of emergent evolution which precludes the acceptance of this conclusion." [2] And in his last book, *Life, Mind and Spirit,* he expresses his conviction that "the Divine personality shines through the Unique Individuality of Christ." [3]

Before we are in a position to determine by a critical study of history whether Jesus stands as the unique manifestation of Deity, whether, indeed, he represents a new emergent level of Deity, we must first raise the question, What is it that constitutes the uniqueness of Christ?

Certain questions have been raised in traditional Christianity which only cloud the issue. Some writers have emphasized the supernatural birth of Jesus as a proof of his Deity. Even if this could be proven, it would not argue for his uniqueness, as he is not the only founder of a religion for whom such a claim has been made. We would still have to show that his supernatural birth had resulted in a character superior to those

[2] *Emergent Evolution,* p. 30. [3] P. 313.

of other creators of religion. Added to this is the consideration that historical criticism throws great doubt upon the fact of all these accounts of miraculous birth. As a result of this criticism the affirmation of such birth becomes an encumbrance to faith rather than an aid to it. The question is not, How was a man born, but what was he after he was born? He might have been miraculously born and have been a devil. The question is, Did his birth result in a character that was a revelation of Deity?

Another argument that has been advanced for the uniqueness of Jesus has been his miracles. But in our day miracles have become the *impedimenta* of religion rather than a valid argument for the truth of it. Hume turned the tables on the theologians when he affirmed that miracles are impossible because they violate the order of nature, and they are incredible because they contradict our human experience. Ever since the day of Hume's skepticism theologians have been so busy trying to show the possibility of miracles that they have had little time to indicate how they support faith. Even though this could be done, the theologians would be faced with another task.

Since the days of Hume, long strides have been taken in the study of other religions, and each religion has its tale of miracles. If miracles are true in one religion, why not in all religions? And if they occurred in all religions, then why has one religion any ground for claiming uniqueness over another?

If, then, the traditional arguments for the Deity of Christ have been destroyed by modern scholarship, let us remember that these arguments were intended to prove that a Supernatural Being came into our world from the outside. So long as this was the thing to be proven these arguments served a purpose. The only question was whether the arguments were true to fact. But as we no longer have to prove that a Supernatural Being came from the outside, we no longer have need of these arguments.

The question we must meet is a much more serious one. It is not enough for us to prove that Christ was Deity to the men of his day. We must show that Christ possessed a character which will meet our idea of Deity. Whatever he may have been to the men of his day, unless he can meet our idea of what Deity is, he must remain as

something less than Deity to us. This ought to be a self-evident fact. Deity has meant different things to different ages. Early peoples thought of Deity as a mysterious Power who could perform acts of magic. The man of the twentieth century discards such an idea of Deity. We approach the question of God with intellectual humility. We fully realize that no man can know God in the totality of his Being. When we think of the universe with its unmeasured spaces and unnumbered stars, we acknowledge the limits of our knowledge of the world in which we live. We know, at best, only a tiny speck of our earth, to say nothing of the vast planets beyond us. How much less we know of God! But while we do not know God in his totality, we know him in the rays of light which come to us. He reaches us in rays of love, in lives of self-sacrifice, in noble character, in the growing good-will of international relationships. We do not look for God in miracles or magic, but in our impulse to care for little children, to alleviate suffering, to lift burdens from the lives of men, and to build a diviner humanity. Where we really touch Deity is in the moral and social values of life. We say of

our mother, "She was a saint of God." We mean that she possessed moral values that were god-like. Deity to us comes through the moral and social values that are leading us forward toward the creation of a better world in which we may live. In other words, God is seen in the emergence of the whole world of spirit, including the ethical and esthetic, which have come to characterize the level of civilization to which the Purposive Plan has brought us.

The question, then, which presses upon the Christian Church of our day is, Was Christ the emergence of Deity at its highest point to the extent that for human purposes he has the value of Deity for us? It may be interesting as a matter of history that he came to be worshiped by men of the century that followed his appearance on the earth, but this need not be vital for us. Men in the past have worshiped many things we have ceased to worship. Unless Christ was such a Being that we can worship, he ceases to be Deity for us.

It must be observed, however, before we proceed further, that faith in Deity does not rest wholly upon the historical character of Jesus.

We have already laid the foundation of belief in Deity in emergent evolution. Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh has pointed out the fact that Christianity does not stand or fall on the historicity of Jesus. "The reasonableness and truth of Deity is demonstrably valid, whether we have any Christology or not, and whatever we may or may not believe about the historic Jesus. It would still be valid if it should turn out that Jesus was essentially different from what has been commonly believed, or even that he was not truly historical at all." [4] If it should be discovered by scholarship that Jesus did not exist, it would be a genuine loss to Christian experience, but the Christian's ideals of life, which have become a part of our humanity, would still continue as valid because they meet the moral needs of men. It is equally true that our faith in Deity is not dependent upon any single person of history. Deity has come into the world at successive emergent levels and has served a purpose in carrying the race to other levels. The emergence of Deity at the life, mind, reason and social stages is a fact which is attested by history, and the Deity which sings all about

[4] *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, pp. 135-136.

us in beauty, goodness, neighborly living, in the strife to destroy war and to bring good-will between the nations of the earth, does not depend for its validity upon the question of historicity raised by the higher critics. Let them do their worst and our faith in Deity will stand secure. Whenever any man, as occasionally happens, proclaims to the world that he has lost his faith in God because he can no longer believe in miracles, the virgin birth or the Deity of Jesus, he simply reveals the fact that his faith has never rested upon the abiding foundations.

But it is also true that the experience of nineteen hundred years in our Western civilization clearly indicates that faith in God is vitally aided if man can find God through some supreme personality. While there are a few rare souls of the mystic type who seem to be able to surmount time and come into immediate contact with the Ineffable, the vast majority of men find the Eternal through the temporal, the unseen through the seen. Such people will always find God through the manifestations of his omnipresent Spirit, rather than by surmounting them and standing in the presence of the Eternal. This attitude will

be rejected by the mystic and scorned by a few of the philosophers. Alfred North Whitehead remarks: "A clear theoretic intellect, with its generous enthusiasm for the exact truth at all costs and hazards, pushes aside symbols as being mere make-believes, veiling and distorting that inner sanctuary of simple truth which reason claims as its own." [5] Yet even these "theoretic intellects" never quite reach the realm for which they strive. At least the symbolism of language always interposes between them and "exact truth." If they move in the realm of the physical sciences, every important hypothesis upon which they work, say gravitation, is reached through the world of concrete facts, and if they work in the realm of philosophy, the world of "exact truth" is reached only through the world of concrete experience. Indeed, much of the work of the philosopher, as of the theologian, is given to the correction of symbolism which always has "a tendency to run wild, like the vegetation in a tropical forest."

Much of the confusion in the religious life of our day has arisen from the criticism which has

[5] *Symbolism*, p. 60.

been given to the symbolism of Jesus as the manifestation of God. A damaging blow at orthodox Christianity has been given by the students of history in their revelation that the garment in which the Christ has been presented to the Church was woven out of the Greek philosophy of the Logos and the mystery religions of the first and second centuries. As this Logos philosophy is no longer credited by our time and as the mystery religions belong to an age of mythology, rather than to an age of exact science, the Christology of the Church has been so far shattered that it no longer wins the consent of thoughtful people.

This traditional symbolism of the Church has been further shaken by the historical critic who has turned his attention to the Gospels which embody the story of Jesus. He has made it clear that it is impossible for us to write a biography of Jesus. The men who were in immediate contact with Jesus when he was on the earth did not think it necessary to commit to writing the story of Jesus' life and sayings. They looked for his immediate return to the earth, when the judgment of the nations would occur and he would reign as Messiah. It was only after this first

generation of disciples began to die and Christ had not yet returned in bodily form that they felt the necessity of committing to paper the story of his life. Luke tells us in the first verse of the Gospel that many had "taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us." These attempts were mostly in the form of diary notes. The Gospel of Mark is in the main one of the earliest of these attempts. The "Words of Jesus" was another. These notes were later used by the men of the last part of the century or the first decade of the second century in writing the four Gospels. These men were not attempting to write an accurate chronological record of Jesus. Their only purpose was to preserve what they considered important deeds and sayings of Jesus for those who were still waiting for him to return. Their chronologies often conflict. They often disagree in the placing of acts and sayings, and these facts frequently are used for different purposes. The result is that no student to-day attempts to write a life of Jesus. This is undertaken only by men who draw upon their imaginations.

We are further embarrassed in our attempt to

reach the historic Jesus by the mingling in the Gospels of what Jesus said and did, with what the disciples conceived him to be. The Gospels were not written by trained historians whose only purpose would have been to record the facts about Jesus, but by loyal followers who attempted to prove a case concerning him. What they tried to prove was what they were hoping would transpire. They were thoroughly Jewish in their ideas concerning the Kingdom of God. They believed the world would come to a catastrophic end and that then the Messiah would come and men and nations would be judged. They believed Jesus to be this kind of a Messiah and, naturally, all they wrote about him was colored by these convictions. Hence, one of the most exacting tasks of the critical students of the New Testament has been to determine who the real Jesus was, in distinction from the Jesus who existed only in the minds of his followers. There is no general agreement between scholars on this question and yet it may be said that we are nearer to-day to regaining the actual Jesus of history than we have been any time since the first century. We can affirm that, as a result of this work of scholar-

ship, we know more about what Jesus actually taught than we know about any other single character of his time. We are far more certain, for instance, of what Jesus represented than we are of the life and teachings of Socrates.

As a result of the work of this scholarship, we are in a position to maintain, as Professor Macintosh of Yale affirms, that "He set before man the true moral example, the true religious example, and the true revelation of God." [6]

He appears in the Gospels as the moral example of the race. We do not affirm this upon the ground that he made this claim, or that his followers so conceived him, but upon the ground that for the needs of humanity in the twentieth century we cannot conceive of any example that is better for us. Nor do we maintain this position on the ground that his moral idealism was wholly new or peculiar to him. On the basis of emergent evolution, we should not expect this to be true. The moral idealism of the past had entered into his nature. He was a child of the ideals of the prophets of Israel. Moses, Amos, Hosea, and the Major and Minor prophets were the

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

moral atoms which had entered into the texture of his being. Even if further investigation should prove, which it has not thus far done, that the social ideals of Buddha and the moral teachings of the Greeks had influenced his life, we should not be disturbed. The moral evolution of the race has advanced only because each age has built upon those that preceded it. Yet in Jesus there emerged a new idealism which was more than the past. When he presented life in his personality and in his teachings, as summarized in love, he gathered not only the past, but gave a new outlook upon the meaning of life for the future. Man, in the light of this idealism, could no longer be conceived in terms of commercial worth equal only to sheep, but must be conceived in terms of an abounding life. The conduct of men was more than individual desire, but must be guided by a desire to build a social structure in which goodwill should dominate. Service rather than profits, ministering unto rather than being ministered unto, became the new impulse which was to guide the actions of men. The Levite and the Scribe may represent the common moral level of men, but the Good Samaritan is the ideal of the future.

If rich young men would enter into the new and eternal life which was to rule the future, they must do it not by conforming to the level of the past, but by having their riches touched by the love impulse which was to determine the future. It is a matter of historical interest to know what the immediate followers of Jesus thought of him, but it is much more vital to know what the men of the twentieth century will do with his life as it appears as a challenge of love. Paganism, with its reliance upon force and commercial profits, is still bidding for the wills of men. Degeneration is a part of evolution, as well as emergence of new factors. The past pulls hard upon the present, and the World War, the clash and prejudices of races, the strife of nations, are testimonies of the power of the past in the present. The nations are in desperate need of a new life, lived in terms of love. Jesus must be worshiped anew, not in ritual form or metaphysical theory, but as the moral ideal that opens a new way to the future for the building of a livable social world.

Through his conception of life in terms of love, Jesus leads us to a conception of God as love and to an ideal of divine sonship in terms of the moral

values which belong to God. His fathers had reached a level of life where they conceived it a duty to love their neighbors but to hate their enemies. Jesus challenged this idea of life on the ground that God "makes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends his rain on the just and the unjust." Because this is what God does, it is what his children ought to do. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." Only by living the values of Deity can you become a child of Deity. The aim of life is to climb above the levels that have emerged in the past history of mankind and seek to live a life of love toward all men, because this is what God does. Seek to be perfect in love as your Father is and you become a manifestation of Deity.

If there is a higher emergence of Deity in our world, we do not know where to look for it. Christ remains for us the highest quality of Deity, not because he came into the world in a miraculous manner, but because he revealed in an exceptional manner the highest expression of the character of God. We may grant that his life was

set in the social world of the Jews of the first century and that he uttered many of his messages in the language used by the men of his day. We may even grant that many of the thought-forms through which his ideas were uttered belonged to his time and passed away with that age. The husks in which the kernel was wrapped may be thrown away, but the grain itself was never more important than it is for our day. In the time when men are fearing the coming of another World War, when the nations are mapping the skies with aerial routes, when trenches will no longer be a protection against poison gas, when nations are nervous over new extensions of power, territory and wealth, there is need for such a religion as Christ had to offer, a religion in terms of love rather than strife, and which will lead men to become sons of God because of the moral values they possess, rather than the profits they may win. Unless the world can be brought to the level of Deity as it emerged in Christ, that a new level of social living may result, humanity may have to repeat the slaughter of the innocents. The essence of faith in the Deity of Jesus is not in some particular credal statement of Christol-

ogy, but, as Macintosh says, in "sincere appreciation of his spiritual value, and whole-hearted response to his spiritual appeal. Indeed, the more we follow him and enter into a similar religious adjustment, the more we find his spirit to be divine." It is not by seeking some infallible statement of dogma that our world is to find Deity. Nothing is more humiliating to the Church of our day than the fact that its members have so largely given their assent to dogma, but have continued to pursue their social and political life on the level of pagan and even savage standards. If the world is to be carried forward, it must be done by the creation of a new level. Christ rests over our world as pull of Deity, who represents the quality of life which must be lived by his followers before they will create a world of divine humanity, the Kingdom of God.

What we have said does not mean that the whole of Deity was found in Christ. All it implies is, that we find the highest emergence of Deity in the moral and spiritual values of Christ. Deity had emerged at many levels before Christ was born. Why should we hesitate to see Deity in Buddha's doctrine of love, his attempt to

destroy the ancient caste system of India, in the emphasis which Confucius gave to the family, or in the new sense of the beautiful which emerged among the Greeks who carved gods of marble and embodied the soul of harmony and loveliness in temples?

Indeed, while the Christ of history was the highest manifestation of Deity that has come to our world at the moral and spiritual levels, this does not mean that the Church must linger about the Man of Galilee and transform him into an idol. Spinoza, with his spiritual insight, saw the real meaning of Christ for a living Church. "I do not think it necessary for salvation to know Christ according to the flesh, but with regard to the Eternal Son of God, that is, the Eternal Wisdom of God, which has manifested itself in all things and especially in the human mind, and above all in Christ Jesus, the case is far otherwise. For without this no one can come to a state of blessedness, inasmuch as it alone teaches what is true or false, good or evil." [7] The Deity that emerged in the historic Jesus was a manifestation of the character of that Deity which is the

[7] *Spinoza's Works*, Vol. II, p. 299.

omnipresent spirit by which our world exists and by which it is being carried forward to ever higher emergents. Even when it appeared that human development had set forth in the direction of degeneration, that the world was determined not to see Deity as it has been manifested in the Christ of history, Deity shone upon the Dark Ages with a new luster in the genius of Michelangelo and Raphael and Andreo del Sarto, in the canvas of Fra Angelico and the cathedrals of Europe. Deity sang a new song to the world which led men to see beauty as well as goodness. When it seemed as if men had lost the creative capacity of mind and the very hope of creating a new earth in love and justice, Deity again burst into our world in the impulse of freedom. Liberty emerged which set the mind free for new adventures in politics, science and philosophy, which was to eventuate in our modern world of culture.

The Church of the Middle Ages made a fetish of Christ which was to deliver men from hell and assure them of heaven. The theologian substituted dogma and the ecclesiastic substituted sacraments for the Christ of spiritual values. The

result was a degenerate Church which adopted the ways of a pagan world, used the sword in place of the Spirit, the inquisition in place of free inquiry. The Reformation chopped off some of the appendages of medievalism, but built upon the essential features of a pagan theology. The Church of the modern day has not had the courage to throw away the whole of this paganism and build anew upon the foundations of a pure, spiritual religion. It will not regain its place as a creator of a new life until it sees the Christ as Deity emerging in a new level of life and finds Deity in our present world speaking through men who have the mind of Christ and who are working to recreate individual and social life by the power of a God of love.

We are led to a position where we can see that our knowledge of God comes to us through an historic process. Natural science alone can never give a religion to us. It can only give us a more or less flexible world in which spiritual realities may find a home. The philosophy of Absolutism, on which most of the theology of the last half of the nineteenth century was built, is not only theoretically untenable, but the Absolute

it affirms is a creation of logic and has no real existence for the religious experience. The attempt of Subjective Idealism, which gives us only a God-idea in consciousness, but a God who has no objective existence, leads us ultimately to atheism. A God who exists only as an idea in consciousness is no God at all. The attempt of theism to prove a First Cause can find no basis in empirical knowledge and culminates in a never-ending chain of causes. It is a chase after a cause which always demands a new cause to create the last one we discovered. On the other hand, materialistic naturalism leaves out of account, or tries to explain away, the whole realm of the religious consciousness. It simply does not know what to do with its theory of knowledge or with its attempt to apply the method of the physical laboratory to the realm of the spiritual world. Hence it relegates it to the realm of myth or tries to explain it on the basis of the behaviorist's conception of conduct. Yet the religious consciousness remains as the most vital factor in our human experience and asserts its vitality over the narrowing explanations of the naturalist. "A thing is what it is; not what it came from," is

the persistent assertion of the religious soul. He claims a sense of Deity in his consciousness which cannot be reduced to any reaction of his nervous system to sense stimulus.

The religious pragmatist who finds that philosophical idealism has failed to serve him and that the materialistic naturalists do not do justice to his religious consciousness, turns to experience as his source of knowledge of God, and not merely to his individual experience, but to the experience of the race in the historic processes.

It is true that the claim of the mystic interests and arrests his attention. When he hears the long line of noble souls claiming an immediate experience of God, he must give them patient consideration; but there are two factors in mysticism which somewhat cool his enthusiasm. First, the mystic at his best does not claim to possess a continuous experience of the presence of God. These experiences come to him only at intervals and between these moments of illumination there are dreary months or years when he knows not God. A knowledge of God which consists only of a few moments of ecstasy can scarcely satisfy the man who seeks a religion that will serve him daily in

life's conflicts. Again, the monistic mystic sacrifices too much knowledge to gain his supreme knowledge. In the hours of his ecstasy he denies the reality of self, time and space in his enjoyment of the one Reality which seems to him alone to be real. Any religious experience which must deny the existence of evil and the reality of self in order to know God is gained at too great a sacrifice to satisfy the man who must assume the reality of self and his environment, whatever else he may believe. What do we gain if we know God but lose the knower and his conflicts in the process?

While a milder mystical element has always been a part of the religious experience and must always remain a part of it, the religious soul will find its more satisfying knowledge of God in history rather than in the negations of the more strenuous mystics. But the question remains: In what historical process are we to find God? The Church has replied: "In the history of Israel, as recorded in the Old and New Testaments." But, if this answer is to stand, it affords little comfort that God was in one small nation, in one restricted area of our globe, and

that all the other nations of history were secular or godless. It must be remembered that this was not the teaching of the Church in its greatest period of creative thought. The Greek fathers had a nobler conception of history. Clement of Alexandria said: "God was the giver of Greek philosophy to the Greeks, by which the Almighty is glorified among the Greeks." "In general terms we may not err in alleging that all things necessary and profitable came to us from God, and that philosophy more especially was given to the Greeks as a covenant peculiar to them, being, as it is, a stepping stone to the philosophy which is according to Christ." The same conception of history was held by Justin Martyr and by Origen. It was not until the Roman Church attempted to limit revelation to the Bible that sacred history was confined to the revelation of God which came only through the Hebrew scriptures.

But such a narrow conception of sacred history could not withstand the assaults of present day criticism. Such a conception of revelation through an historic process is entirely misleading. It is not revelation through a process of history.

It is only the breaking in of a supernatural Being, who is above and beyond all history, into one small phase of history and, hence, becomes not revelation through an historic process, but a miracle which was wrought in spite of the action of free spirit through history.

We have learned that the history of Israel was not isolated from the rest of the world, but was bound up with the whole historic movement of the Semitic world. It was only a few years ago that we thought of the Jews as God's chosen people, living an isolated life for the definite purpose of making God's will known to mankind. But in the last hundred years we have learned to translate the languages of the people who surrounded Israel; we have dug into their mounds and discovered their ancient civilizations; we have translated their literatures, and through these avenues we have found that Israel was as much a part of that ancient world as the United States is a part of our modern world. We have found that many of the ideas of the Bible were as much a part of that whole Semitic world as our ideas are a part of the Anglo-Saxon world; that many of their stories belonged to Babylon, and that

even their later writings, like those of the prophets, were the product of international controversies, just as many of our great books are the fruit of the international relations created by the World War. Thus we are compelled to assume that God was revealed in all ancient history, or he was not in any of it. It was all secular history, or else it was all sacred. It is only a step from this position to say that all history, ancient and modern, is a revelation of God, or else none of it is revelation. Are we, then, driven to the position where we must surrender entirely the idea of revelation in history and approach the whole historic process in the spirit of secularism?

This is doubtless true if we continue to think of Deity in terms of alien influx and of revelation as a supernatural breaking into history to make known the will of a Supernatural Being. But it need not be true if we think of Deity as a manifestation of moral and social values, and if we think of revelation in terms of the discovery of these values in the evolving process of history. There is in every period of history a Pull, or idealizing tendency, which is not only drawing

mankind forward to a richer life, but out of this very Pull man becomes conscious of Deity that is in the process, causing discontent with things as they are and compelling men to reach forward to greater good and love to-morrow. There are not only social and moral values present with us, but there are greater moral and social values ahead of us which must be incorporated in the ever growing Kingdom of God. Out of all this comes the conviction that God is the reality which gives birth to this intuition of Deity. Isaiah heard this call of his country but through the call he found God, to whom he replied: "Here am I, send me." The experience of God becomes the creative Factor which keeps us ever moving forward in advance of things as they are and toiling for the coming of his Kingdom.

It is this experience of our humanity through the processes of history which reaches its moral and spiritual culmination in the character of Jesus. He has for us the value of Deity because he was so completely identified with goodness and love that we can conceive of no higher Deity in our world. We do not look for any greater to come. We cannot think of any greater discovery

of the divine qualities in our universe. The world has not outgrown him. It has scarcely yet started on its journey to live as he lived. The experience of the Man of Nazareth remains the undisputed goal of the ages. He awakens in us a sense of the fullness of life, the end of moral excellence, the social need of the ages. We can conceive of no Deity higher than that with which Jesus was in harmony and no Kingdom greater than that for which he strove. As Lyman says: "Through him we come to know God as nowhere else in the world. Every earnest soul that has faced the great moral issues of life will find in him the supreme evidence that there is in the universe a divine power that is able to deal with those issues. Every soul that is weak and dejected or oppressed with guilt will find in Christ the fullest assurance of the Heavenly Father's nearness and forgiving love."

Jesus does not become Deity for us because he was miraculously thrust into our humanity from the outside. He was Deity because he became one with the divine goodness and love that were in the very processes of history and because he saw that there were divine values to

be incorporated in the life of the world, if humanity was to achieve its goal. He discovered Deity in the history of the past and in the life of his day, and he wrought out his divinity through the real life of his generation. He did not proceed from an abstract philosophy of a First Cause and try to justify history as the revelation of the preëstablished will of that First Cause. He never argued about God. He simply found the abounding life in his oneness with Deity and out of that abounding life he made men conscious of the presence of God. He was the way, the truth and the life to his followers because he led them to find their Lord and Redeemer in their experience of Deity through love and goodness. He becomes our Savior because he vitalizes the divine that is in our lives and gives us the conviction that through Deity we can win our individual moral victories and establish the kingdom of love and goodness to the ends of the earth.

CHAPTER IV

RELIGION OF REDEMPTION

CHRISTIANITY has always claimed to be a religion of redemption. It is not unique in this particular. Most of the living religions make the same claim. They may all point to some degree of success, and they may also be charged with a large measure of failure. We need not turn to the religions that are competitors with Christianity, as our problem concerns only the place of Christ as Savior and Redeemer in the scheme of emergent evolution.

If Christ was the highest manifestation of Deity that came out of the evolving world, and if through that manifestation he opened the way to a new level of life for mankind, it is equally clear that soon after his death his followers mistook the husk in which his conception of life had been wrapped for the kernel. He had expressed his life through the thought-forms of his fathers

and his disciples were so enamored with the thought-forms that they were never able to free themselves from them. The original Apostles were Jews and they remained Jews in their conception of Jesus to the end of their days. They had been trained in a literature, covering approximately one hundred and fifty years, which had pictured the present world as bad, under the rule of Satan and his angels. Before the world could become better, it must be destroyed, all present things come to an end, and a new heaven and a new earth must be created.

They believed that the overthrow of this present evil age could not be accomplished by moral instruction. So long as Satan was in control, moral and social betterment was impossible. Satan and his hosts must be overthrown and this could only be accomplished by the miraculous intervention of God. This was a characteristic feature of all this literature. The reason for it may be understood when we realize that the apocalyptic movement was born of the Pharisees. They were a class comfortably situated in life, enjoying both ease and respect, and they were naturally opposed to social revolution in this pres-

ent world which would disturb their incomes. There was a time when they appeared to put their faith in the sword as a means of overthrowing their oppressors, but experience had taught them that this could not realize their hopes. Israel's enemies were too strong for a little nation, and the Pharisees came gradually to transfer their hopes from present deliverance by revolution to faith in the ultimate interference of God in the affairs of men in a transcendental world when the kingdom would be established.

The Pharasaic origin of the Psalms of Solomon seems clear and in them the vice-regent of God, who is to establish the kingdom, is not a man of war who puts his "trust in horses or cavalry or bows or arrows." His victories are to be won "with the word of his mouth" (Pss. of Sol. xvii. 36-39). Shailer Mathews says: "The expression is a true echo of Pharisaism. . . . The author of the Psalm does not wish to be understood as counseling war, and therefore falls back on miracle. The Christ is to be so mighty that he does not need to fight." [1] There were zealots who believed in revolution, but the power-

[1] *Messianic Hope of the New Testament*, p. 43.

ful Pharisaic party, which wanted to keep the present social order quiet, turned attention entirely from political methods and pictured the far-away days when the end would be accomplished by supernatural means.

Most of these writers agreed that a judgment should accompany this destruction of the world. The oppressors and the sinners would go away into torment, but the righteous would live in peace and goodness. The Ezra literature, probably written some time after Christ, reflected this thought common to the earlier writers. "A day of judgment shall be the end of the age and the beginning of the eternal age that is to come; wherein corruption is passed away, weakness is abolished, infidelity is cut off; while righteousness is grown and faithfulness is sprung up." [2] While the Ezra literature does not look forward to a restoration of the Jewish nation in Jerusalem, nor a resurrection of the body, but an immediate entrance of the righteous into a state of everlasting happiness, most of the writers of the apocalyptic literature before the time of Christ looked for the establishment of the nation in Jerusalem.

[2] Ezra-Apocalypse, vii. 113-114.

It would be composed of the righteous who had been raised from sheol and who would enjoy the blessedness of the redeemed kingdom for a period of limited duration, some stating the time as four hundred years and others as a thousand years.

We find in this literature divergent opinion concerning the part the Messiah was to play in this kingdom. Sometimes the Christ was conceived as God's Elect who would overthrow all enemies and establish the kingdom, and by others he was pictured as coming at the end of the judgment when the righteous would have a blessed fellowship with him. By some writers, as Enoch, he was conceived as preëxisting from all eternity, and by others he was pictured as a man of power who would lead his people. But, in most of this literature the Messiah played an important rôle and was the hope of the discouraged people who were looking for a better day.

It was in this framework of thought that the Apostles placed Jesus. They apparently missed the essential life he manifested and soon regarded him as the Messiah who would return to the earth, bring upon it a destructive judgment and establish the Messianic kingdom. It was for this

reason that they never thought of establishing a Church and felt no necessity for recording their Master's life and sayings. Only when the original band was decreased by death and Christ still had not returned, did they feel the necessity of recording notes on his deeds and teachings. Throughout the years following the crucifixion, they regarded Jesus as the Savior in the form of a Jewish Messiah who would make an end of the present evil world and give them a place in the glorified kingdom. Had Christianity never become anything more than it was represented to be by these disciples, it would never have extended beyond Judaism.

What saved Christianity was its contact with the Greek and Roman peoples. First, it was transformed from a Jewish faith into an oriental product by its contact with the mystery religions. There were many of these religions about the Mediterranean. They differed widely in their traditions, but most of them possessed this in common: their gods were reputed to die once a year, probably corresponding to the seasons, and to rise again. As time passed, this mythology ceased to be a touching and dramatic story and

came to be associated in some vital way with human destiny. It was a decadent period, when earth appeared to offer little for human satisfaction. Men naturally looked for satisfaction in the future life. They longed for immortality in a world of eternal felicity. In the death and resurrection of their gods they found this hope fulfilled. Man was incapable of attaining unto this future life by any power he possessed within himself. It was only by his mystical union with his god who had died and rose again that he could enter into eternal bliss. The destiny of the Divine Savior became "the guarantee of the same destiny for his followers."

It is becoming increasingly evident that this conception of a dying and risen god had some influence upon the early Christian faith. These mystery religions were known in Tarsus, where Paul was born, and he was evidently familiar with them. While he was fundamentally a Jew and the Jewish rather than the Hellenic influence is strongest in his letters, yet no one can read them without feeling that the central idea of the Mysteries exerted a strong influence over him. Professor Francis Greenwood Peabody says: "Sages

from the Orient had brought to Rome their mysteries, but in Christ the mystery-drama of redemption had been historically enacted on a Palestinian stage. All that vagrant mystic and scholastic metaphysicians were offering in Rome as wares to attract the thoughtful became appropriated by the receptive mind of Paul." Christ became the great Mystery, the intermediary divinity, the "likeness of the unseen God." He was the Lord who had died and rose again and through union with the risen Lord men were to gain eternal life.

It was largely through the fact that Christianity in the first century became clothed in the thought-forms of the mystery religions that it was saved from the death it would have met had it remained in the hands of Palestinian Christians. A. Loisy has clearly stated this fact in his *Pagan and Christian Mysteries:* "It was to the Christion mysteries, not to the Gospel of Jesus, that the ancient world was converted, or could be converted. The ancient world would never have consented to become Jewish. Instead of changing the Gospel, as is often said, the mystery saved the Gospel by making it a relatively universal religion . . . a religion independent of Judaism,

a scheme of universal salvation." Whether these mysteries "saved the Gospel," as Loisy asserts, is a debatable question. They certainly transformed the Gospel into a doctrine of redemption which had never found expression from the lips of Jesus. They gave the death and resurrection a prominence in the Church of the future which Jesus nowhere predicted. But, more important still, they transformed the conception of salvation from a present Kingdom of God into a future state of blessedness which was to leave the earth and its inhabitants in the power of Satan.

Whatever may have been the influence of the mystery religions upon the writers of the New Testament, it is evident that in the second century Christianity had ceased to be a Way of Life and was becoming an elaborate ritual. Men were to find salvation through union with a crucified and risen God. This union was not effected through moral values, but through such sacraments as baptism and the eucharist, the two sacraments which had gained their meaning from the mystery religions rather than from the simple Lord's Supper of the early Christians and the simple ceremony of baptism as practiced by the Jews.

Christ, instead of being approached as Deity because he was the manifestation of a new level of life, was being translated into a risen God who was to guarantee immortality to men because, through the mysteries or sacraments, men were to enter into his destiny.

While Tertullian, who lived during the last part of the second and the first quarter of the third century, devoted a large part of his writings to a repudiation of the pagan philosophers, it is clear that the teachings of these philosophers had entered into the texture of his faith and he was unconsciously supporting them. His book on *Baptism,* while it is clothed in the language of the Bible, is distinctly the point of view of the mystery religion rather than the Jewish. He begins his book with this sentence: "Happy is our sacrament of water, in that, by washing away the sins of our early blindness, we are set free and admitted into eternal life." These words and their exposition were called forth by the teachings of the Jews who were making trouble for the Church. They boldly declared that there was no miraculous, divine substance in water which could affect the soul in a manner that was being

claimed by the Church. Baptism was only a symbol of an inner spiritual process. Tertullian showed how far the Church had drifted from the Jewish symbolism and how completely Christianity had come under the influence of Hellenism. He affirmed that water "sanctified by the Holy One," gains a sanctifying power. "Therefore, after the waters have been in a manner endued with medicinal virtue through the intervention of the angel, the spirit is corporeally washed in the waters, and the flesh is in the same spiritually cleansed." [3] From this period it is understood that a catechumen could only enter into the fullness of the Christian gifts and graces through the mystery of baptism. The sacrament had already attained its threefold significance. It must begin with instruction and the exorcism of the evil spirit from the applicant, followed by immersion and the laying on of hands and anointing with holy oil. It is easy to see in this sacrament the influence of the Mysteries. Christianity had become Hellenized and the believer entered into the fellowship of Christ only by the miraculous effect of the Holy Water.

[3] *Anti-Nicene Fathers,* Vol. III, p. 671.

We also behold, during these years, the simple apostolic communion meal being transformed into the Mass. It is no longer a ceremony where the followers of Christ are to "do this in remembrance of me," but has become one of the Mysteries by which men are to partake of a supernatural substance through the bread and wine. The Supper has been translated into a dramatic assemblage which presents it "as a sacrifice in which the god becomes the voluntary victim over again." Guignebert has summarized the change that has come over the Church in its use of the meal. "It became all this only because implanted in the Christian consciousness is (1) the conviction that the Lord is in person present in the Eucharist assembly, in a contact direct and a communion immediate with his followers, and also (2) a notion of what we call transubstantiation. The point to be understood is, that the consecration pronounced upon them effects an alteration of the bread into the flesh and the wine into the blood of Jesus in such a way that the consumption of the consecrated elements constitutes both a material and a spiritual interfusion of Lord and Christian and in the form which

the Lord himself had indicated as appropriate to the fulfillment of the mystery." [4]

This tendency to convert the meal into a Mystery began with Paul and was carried further by the writer of the Gospel of John. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." No one can fail to detect in these words the influence of the mystery religions. The worshipers of Dionysius ate the sacred animal raw, believing that they were actually eating their god. Justin Martyr observes that the Mystery of Mithras had borrowed this sacrament from the Christians. He calls them "wicked devils" [5] who had imitated the Christians. But Mithraism existed before Christianity was born. It was a widespread religion before the Christian meal was instituted and the close resemblance between its sacred meal and that of the Christians indicates that the imitation came from the Christians rather than the followers of the pagan religion. To what extent the early meal had been changed

[4] *Christianity*, p. 59. [5] *First Apology*, ch. 66.

into a Mystery is indicated by Justin's description: "For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of his Word and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of Jesus who was made flesh." [6]

We must make it clear that at this stage of the development of Christianity the moral values had not been lost from it. While the person of Christ had been translated into a dying and risen God, and while union with this Christ was effected through the sacrament of the miraculously transformed bread and wine, the result of this union was a new moral life in the participant. Paul taught that the believer who entered into the mystical union with the Lord should lead the same type of ethical life that characterized Christ. The body was the temple of the Holy Spirit and should be kept clean as a

[6] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 185.

proper dwelling place for the Holy Visitor. The fruits of the indwelling spirit were ethical—love, temperance, purity and goodness. The fact that a Christian had entered into fellowship with the Lord made it imperative that he should reproduce a God-like type of character.

This same high ethical tone is found in most of the Christian writings of the second and third centuries. Clement of Alexandria teaches that the aim of the Christian must be the attainment of the good life. "Only the doing of good out of love, and for the sake of its own excellence, is to be the Gnostic's choice." [7] The supreme good which the Christian must seek is a "knowledge about God," a mystic oneness with God where he reaches "a state of passionlessness, waiting to put on the divine image." [8] Tertullian, in his plea for Christians before their persecutors, pictures their manner of life. They refrain from the worship of "the frivolous works of the human hand." They lead temperate lives, practice chastity, "which we pollute not even with a look," show compassion, "which prompts us to help the needy," and they follow truth and liberty, "for

[7] *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 434. [8] *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 112.

which we have learned to die." [9] Lactantius even bases his argument for immortality upon the virtuous life. Vice is temporary and of short duration, gaining its reward in this world, but virtue is permanent and constant and receives its reward in the future. "Righteousness alone procures for man eternal life."

But there was no thought in the minds of these Christians of fashioning their lives according to the divine values for the sake of building a diviner humanity on the earth. It never entered their minds to build an ideal Republic, such as Plato had conceived. Their dogmas and ritual grew out of a decadent period of civilization when men of any degree of idealism took a pessimistic attitude toward the present world. It was impossible for these Christians to entertain any hope of lifting the world in which they lived to the level of life which was manifested in Christ. The present world was under the dominance of Satan. Hence, these Christians could only conceive of a salvation that was projected beyond this vale of tears into the future life. Lactantius, who has been called the Christian Cicero on

[9] *Ibid.*, Vol. VII, p. 211.

account of the clearness and sweetness of his style, as well as his varied erudition, who was probably born about the middle of the third century, gives expression to this outlook upon life: "The one chief good is immortality, for the reception of which we were originally formed and born." He repudiates the contention of the Greek philosophers that any ultimate good can be found for life on the earth. He is giving expression to what had become the accepted faith of Christians. They insisted that the faithful should practice the Christian virtues, but only because this was necessary to fit them for the reception of Christ in the world to come. There was no thought in their minds that they should follow the life of love and good-will that they might make the earth a fit place for the Kingdom of God. The present world was to pass away. It was useless to try to reform it. Lactantius drew a gloomy picture of the future of all earthly governments. An enemy shall appear out of the north who shall set up a detestable and tyrannical reign. "Cities shall be overthrown." There shall be earthquakes and frequent diseases and repeated famines. "The atmosphere shall be tainted, and

become corrupt and pestilential." The earth shall give no fruits to man and the fields shall produce nothing. The rivers shall be dried up and the waters shall be changed into blood and bitterness. Comets shall appear to frighten men and the sun shall be perpetually darkened. "The loftiest mountains shall also fall and be leveled with the plains; the sea will be rendered unnavigable." Then a trumpet shall sound from heaven and "all shall tremble and quake at the mournful sound." The anger of God shall be revealed and the anguish shall be so great that the living shall congratulate the dead. "The human race will be so consumed, that scarcely a tenth part of men will be left." [10] So long as these Christians lived under such a conception of the destiny of all things on the earth, they could not give any thought to building a better world for human habitation. They were zealous in the practice of the Christian virtues, but only because these virtues assured them they would escape the pending doom and enter into the blessed immortality with their God.

Thus far the Church had practiced a large

[10] *Ibid.*, Vol. VII, p. 213.

degree of freedom. Tertullian declared that "every man should worship according to his own convictions. It is assuredly no part of religion to compel religion—to which free-will and not force should lead us." [11] The creative life, which syncretized the many religious and philosophical tendencies from the first to the third centuries, is a testimony to the liberalism which dominated the leaders of the new Church. But necessity was soon felt for laws for inclusion and exclusion within the Church and the Christianity which had saved the Jewish religion from death by adjusting the faith to Hellenism was early reduced to orthodoxy. It still retained a measure of pliancy and adaptability which it was to retain for many centuries, even to the Council of Trent, which met in 1545. But from the fourth century orthodoxy in doctrine was to a large degree established which could be proclaimed to the faithful as the Word of God. It was a magnificent system of dogma and ritual which was intended to fit men for salvation in a future life.

The triumph of the Church, however, over the Roman State was the ultimate defeat of Chris-

[11] *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 105.

tianity. As the days of persecution ended, as the Church had won over the State, and as the world had not come to an end and Christ had not returned, the pursuit of the moral values of Christianity, the one thing which had been the glory of the Church, was soon lost among a people who began to adjust themselves to the secular world. It was a victory which the early Christians would have regarded as a catastrophe. While the Christians did not "in practice renounce the actual life without which their religion would have lost its meaning, they no longer sought its realization. With them, a belief in dogmatic assertions and a faith in magic efficacy attached to certain rites took the place of personal effort which the Gospel demanded." [12] As they ceased to look for the end of the world and the return of Christ, and as there rested upon the Church the guidance of secular affairs, the early idealism of the Church was dimmed by her contact with realism and her immersion in secularism.

This process was further hastened by the absorption of the mass of northern barbarians into her life. While these northern peoples were

[12] *Christianity,* by Guignebert, p. 186.

nominally "converted" to Christianity and received baptism from the Church, they were never actually Christianized. For centuries to come there was to continue the process of syncretizing Roman dogma and ritual with the tribal religions of the northern peoples. The Christian values which had been preserved through the early days of the Church were almost completely lost. The mass of the people, while obedient to the Church, which offered a way of escape from future torment, lived a distinctly pagan life. The priesthood gradually lost both its moral idealism and its intellectual creativeness. Even the Papacy degenerated to such a low moral level that it became an object of offense to the none too virtuous body of the faithful.

It must not be forgotten that while this was the state of the official Church and the great body of her membership, yet there were signs throughout even these darkest ages that the real spirit of Christianity was not wholly dead. In monastery and convent there were holy men and women who tried, according to their light, to walk in the way of their Master. Mysticism, which never wholly disappeared, was a constant re-

minder of the Spirit and from time to time there arose strong religious leaders who tried to revive moral idealism, both in the priesthood and the faithful. It was to a large extent this dissatisfaction with the state of the Church, and the various movements which were born of this discontent, that paved the way for the great schism which resulted in the Reformation.

While this conflict between the Reformers and the Church of Rome resulted in a quickening and consequent elevation of the moral life in both Churches, the scheme of salvation remained practically identical, both in the Roman and Protestant Churches. The Reformed Church rejected many of the sacraments and denied much of the ecclesiasticism of Rome, but its attitude toward the dogmas was essentially the same. Both Churches regarded the world as static, having been created perfect by a Carpenter-God a few thousand years previous. Through the fall of man in the Garden of Eden, mankind passed under the curse of God. The deliverance of men from this terrible doom was to be effected by a God who died and rose again. The manner in which this deliverance was to be accomplished had been explained

in various ways, but the fact that salvation was to be gained only through the death of this god, the god of the mystery religions, was universally recognized. Furthermore, it was still the old Roman type of salvation, a salvation which did not concern itself with the remaking of this world, but was to be fully realized only in the future life. Romanism and Protestantism have brought this ancient theology down to our time and they are offering it to men of the twentieth century who have ceased to regard the world and life under these categories of thought. The old system of theology, born out of a decadent civilization, where men took only a pessimistic attitude toward the earth and all that was in it, is offered to a generation that is conscious of its power, that believes it can conquer the earth, and takes an optimistic attitude toward the future. It is a system which was born out of the abstractions of Hellenic metaphysics and is offered to a generation which trusts only in the scientific method. It is a system which is hedged about with authority and is offered to a people who are bent upon free inquiry.

Such Churches cannot meet the needs of our

day by "activity." All of their professed "revival," propaganda and "practical" endeavor only cover their essential sickness. They belong to the past. They will not meet the needs of our day until they cease to be Churches of antiquity and speak to the people a language which grows out of our world of science and moral idealism.

The Church must redefine its dogma of redemption before it will be in a position to speak to our modern world. What is salvation? This is a word which is constantly used by preachers. One hundred years ago every layman in the pew knew what the minister meant when he used this term. To-day the layman has the haziest idea concerning what is in the mind of the preacher when he speaks on this theme. The Roman Catholic still clings to the teaching of his Church and from the instruction he receives in youth he believes that he must escape, through the agency of his Church, "eternal torment." He has been taught to believe that "the punishment of the wicked shall last as long as the recompense of the just, that is, for eternity." [18] Whatever may be the manner of his life when he is in the world, he

[18] *Christian Apologetics,* by Rev. W. Devivier, S.J.

attends his Church and observes its rules that he may escape in the world to come the torments of hell. There are a few laymen among the Fundamentalists who also have a clearly defined conception of salvation in terms of escape from future punishment. But the thing that is of vital importance in the lives of these laymen, so far as they are intelligent, is that what they are trying to accomplish for six days of the week, namely, the making of a better humanity on the earth, has little or no relationship to the faith they express on Sunday. This Sunday-faith grew out of a period when Christians did not think it was possible to redeem the earth. The present world was in the power of Satan and must be brought to an end by a terrible judgment. These Christians were seeking the only salvation which seemed possible for them, a salvation in the future life. But both the Roman Catholic and the Fundamentalist of our day believe that they can redeem the present world. They give much of their thought and money for the making of a more habitable earth. The result is that they find a constant clash between their daily practice and their ancient faith. They spend most of their

time in saving the world and they go to Church on Sunday to save their souls from a post-mortem torment. The things in which they are interested for six days in the week are very real, while the path they follow in Church is accepted only by a blind faith. It is this fact which gives to the Church of tradition a note of unreality and makes religion a by-product rather than the chief business of mankind.

The layman who has been only half converted to Modernism is in a much more uncertain position when he thinks of salvation. He has rejected the idea of "eternal torment," but has not wholly escaped from the traditional notion that salvation has to do with the world to come. He vaguely asserts that "earth must be made a heaven," but he sings with great emotional warmth the hymns which refer his salvation to the future. He is a Modernist with a strong tinge of traditionalism.

Added to this confusion in the minds of churchmen concerning the meaning of salvation is a growing uncertainty about the reality of immortality in the minds of multitudes of people. Hosts of people have lost their interest in this

problem because they feel that it cannot be proven. At best it remains to them a "hope" but a hope so vague that it has ceased to be an important factor in their lives. Other men assume a wholly agnostic attitude toward the question. They neither deny nor affirm it. There are some who even deny it as a reasonable hope. While there are still many devout souls who possess a strong faith that "eternal form shall still divide eternal soul from all beside and I shall know him when we meet," this faith does not have any noticeable influence upon their daily conduct.

This modern attitude toward the problem of immortality, added to the vagueness of man's thought concerning a future salvation, has been further complicated by the rise of the physical and social sciences which has set man to the task of building a better world on the earth. Thayer wisely writes: "When Fulton launched his paddle wheel steamer *Clermont,* when Stephenson started his locomotive *Rocket* on its first trip, mankind set out on a career of conquest compared with which the campaigns of Cæsar were transitory, and the empire of Napoleon provincial." [14]

[14] *Life and Times of Cavour,* Vol. I, p. 56.

The spread of this kingdom of science has created a race of optimists rather than pessimists. Men are fighting to rid the world of disease, to purge it of war, to care for children, to ennoble and enrich womanhood, to decrease crime, to spread education and to beautify the earth by art.

These several tendencies have centered our attention upon the earth rather than upon heaven and hell. The united power of a traditional Church can no longer stay the tide that is running against it. So long as the Church offers a salvation that grew out of a degenerate and pessimistic age, it will be a Church without power in the twentieth century. Not until the Church is brave enough to say, "The world out of which our conception of salvation grew has passed away and with it the idea of salvation we have proclaimed has passed," will the Church be in a position to syncretize its gospel again with a new world of thought. Salvation must be redefined in terms of moral values which are to be utilized in lifting our present life to a new level of moral and spiritual living. The Church must become the agency in our life of raising men and women

to that level of Deity which was manifested in Jesus. The human race is anxiously waiting for the coming of a better day. A discontent with the level of life that still carries on its surface the World War, the racial strife, and the nations frantically competing with each other, filling men with a fear of another war, offers to the Church the most vital opportunity it has had since Christianity was carried from Palestine into Greece. If the Church will be courageous enough to undertake the task of saving men and nations, that is, motivating life with Deity at the emergent level of Jesus of Nazareth, it may again lead civilization forward and become the spiritual regenerator of the race.

The Church must be equally courageous in presenting the method by which a new motivation is to be given to life. For sixteen hundred years the Church has been following in essence the theology of the early Roman Fathers. They thought of man as a fallen creature under the curse of God, doomed to eternal punishment unless he could escape that curse. How was he to escape? Gregory was the first one to try to formulate the method by which man escaped.

He seized upon the New Testament word "ransom" and said Christ was the ransom from sin. He believed the devil had tricked man and made him a slave in the Garden of Eden and he would not surrender his captive until he was paid a large sum. Christ died and through his death paid the price the devil demanded. This was the view that was held by the Church for a thousand years. But as the intelligence of man grew, this theory became too grotesque to believe. In the eleventh century there came an Italian, Anselm, who gave to the Church a new theory. He seized upon the New Testament word "debt" and he made this word the keynote of his theory. He said sin is a debt and sin against an infinite being is an infinite debt. A finite being cannot pay an infinite debt, hence an infinite being must come in order that the debt may be paid. The Son of God, therefore, assumed the form of a man and by his sufferings on the cross paid the debt which allowed humanity to go free. This theory was better than the one given by Gregory, but it was not final. Men either modified it or rejected it altogether in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Martin Luther and Calvin took the word "pro-

pitiation" and made it the basis of their interpretation. According to them, God was a great governor and man had broken the law, but transgression must be punished. If the man who breaks the law is not punished, someone must be punished in his stead. Jesus, therefore, came to the earth and suffered the punishment which rightly belongs to sinners. He was not guilty, but the punishment was imputed to him and God wrought upon his innocent head the penalty which rightfully belongs to transgressors. It was known as the penal substitution theory.

Some men could not believe that God was such a monster as this theory assumed. A Dutchman by the name of Hugo Grotius, a lawyer, gave another theory, known as the governmental theory. He said God is the moral governor and his government must be maintained. Laws cannot be broken with impunity. Unless sin is abandoned, the dignity of God's moral government must be destroyed. Therefore, that man may see how hot is God's displeasure against sin, Christ came into the world and suffered the consequences of the transgressions of the race. The cross is an illustration of what God thinks about

sin. This theory was brought to this country and became the theory of the Congregational Church during the last century.

When we pierce to the heart of these theories, they all rest upon the idea of a Tyrant-King who is offended by man's sin and who will not forgive unless he is paid his price, and the death of Christ is the price that is paid. In any way we look at these theories, by the most liberal interpretation that can be given to them, God is a Shylock demanding his pound of flesh.

These theories are no longer satisfactory to us because our increase in knowledge has given to us a different conception of God and of man. We are living in a vast world which we know has come to be what it is by a gradual process of development. We no longer think of man as having been created a perfect being in the beginning and then having fallen. We know that man has evolved out of lower forms of life until he has reached his present state of moral and spiritual divinity. We no longer think of God as a being who presides over the world as a great Governor or Judge, but we think of him as creative good-will that is at the heart of the evolving

process. We no longer hope to restore mankind to a primitive state that has been lost. Hence we have no need for a god who died to stand between us and a wrathful God before we can have our sins forgiven. Our conceptions of God, man and salvation, based on the doctrine of evolution, render the whole idea of salvation, through the sacrificial death of Christ, obsolete.

Again, we must face the fact that the traditional idea that man is helpless to save himself has suffered at the hands of twentieth century culture. The idea that man has no ability to save himself belongs to the period of pessimism, when men felt themselves wholly lost and in the power of Satan. To-day, man is conscious of his power and knows that if he ever wins his salvation it must be by his own hands and brain. His conquests over disease, his mastery of the physical forces of the earth, his strides in moral and social reforms, his achievements in education and his victories won over tyranny, and the spread of the spirit of democracy, have shown him that he is capable of lifting life to new levels.

Furthermore, the theory of evolution which has won our age, makes it clear that man is a

part of the evolving process. He does not dwell outside of it nor above it. Whatever Deity is in the scheme of Nature dwells also in man. If there is a nisus in the whole pyramid of life, an omnipresent Spirit, by the power of which emergents emerge, that Spirit is in each individual man and becomes the power by which he is to develop a better to-morrow.

What is the method, then, by which man is to win a new level of life for himself and for nations? There is no place in our modern scheme of thinking for any god who is to stand between us and offended Deity, that his wrath may be averted from us. Deity sings all about us in our developing world. What men need is education and motivation that they may be lifted to a new level of moral and social living. Deity beckons to us through every avenue of life. The scientist is helping us to understand the methods by which God works for the creation of a better world. Students of physics have opened to us the marvelous world of law. Biologists have opened to us a world where coöperation and mutual service operate from the first cell to the League of Nations. Sociologists are picturing to

us a social world where no man lives to himself and where coöperation must be the law of all men and nations. The Church must lead men to a reverent attitude toward this world of divine forces that they may have faith in themselves to utilize this knowledge to build the Kingdom of God on the earth.

But in addition to this process of education, the Church must supply the motivation which comes from man's fellowship with Deity as it is manifested in Christ. Macintosh truly says: "When Jesus' character is taken as a revelation of the character of God, and Jesus' love to men as revelation of God's love to men; and when as a consequence the individual comes to God in trust and love and self-surrender; or, in other words, when one faithfully follows the religious example of Jesus, moral salvation is the result. This means that, as the historic source of an experience which is really the work of God, Jesus exercises the *divine function* of saving man from his sin." [15]

We must add that when the Church causes us to live in the thought and moral excellence of

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

Jesus, in other words, places man in the presence of Deity on the emergent level of Jesus, not only does the Christ exercise "the divine function of saving man from his sins," but he causes us to enter a new life on the level of love, good-will, coöperation and mutual service that all human relationships may be transformed by this divine life. Deity becomes a reality to us because Deity is awakened within us and because we give ourselves to the manifestation of Deity in the creation of a new social order. Our fellowship with the Christ of history enables us to recognize the Eternal Christ that works in the present, speaking through the idealistic social movements of our day, and welling up in us as the Pull toward a better future. Love becomes the motivation of life, directing our purposes, quickening our intellectual search, binding science and the Church in the one supreme task of creating a world that is ruled by good-will and guided by wisdom.

Had the Church followed the spiritual insights of the Greek Fathers rather than the Latin, the Church would not be so far at odds with our modern world as it finds itself to-day. Clement of Alexandria, for instance, found no place in his

scheme of thought for the doctrine of sacrificial expiation for sin, as that doctrine has come to be understood through the influence of the Roman Church. There was no such need, according to Clement's thought, that God should be reconciled with humanity, for there was no schism between God and mankind, such as the later Church represented. He was a Greek who conceived of sin as the result of ignorance as well as willfulness and mankind was to be redeemed by Wisdom which came from indwelling Deity. "With all his Power the Instructor of humanity, using all the resources of Wisdom, devotes Himself to the saving of the Children." This was possible because there had never been a broken relationship between God and humanity, but rather "the revelation of a relationship which had always existed, indestructible in its nature, obscured but not obliterated by human ignorance and sin." Humanity was conceived as constitutionally allied with God and because of this relationship man might be educated by Deity until it became one with truth and goodness. It is true that this conception of Clement is wrapped in the Logos philosophy of the Greeks. He conceives of the

Instructor as the eternal Logos. This type of philosophy no longer fits our ways of thinking. It is in metaphysical rather than in moral terms and belongs to a static rather than an evolving world. Yet the heart of his thought is closely related to our best reading of our world in terms of emergent evolution. We no longer have any place in our thought for a God who is set over against and is outside of a humanity that is doomed and damned. God is in the whole process of evolution, including the human race. His character is manifested in man at the various stages of emergent levels and his Personality is manifested at the highest level in the supreme personality of Jesus. In proportion as the Church brings men into touch with Deity at this level, is the Deity that is within men lifted and quickened, and in proportion as men are motivated by this new impulse of love, do they go forth to recreate a world in the relationships of love.

CHAPTER V

WORSHIP

RELIGION must prove its worth through the experience of the reality of the object worshiped. If we could prove by reason the existence of God, we might still have a God who is no real help to us. The astronomer might prove by abstract mathematics that there is a sun, yet the sun would not be real to us until we could feel its warmth. In like manner, man might prove the existence of God to the perfect satisfaction of his logical reason, and still God might not be a place of refuge to the sorrowing or a way of escape for the sinful. The final test of our religion will not be whether our logic is conclusive, but whether our worship is satisfying.

The unrest of Protestantism is clearly revealed in its search for a more satisfying form of worship. The ministers of the Church are holding frequent conferences on worship, trying to dis-

cover methods to enrich it and to bring more reality into it, while there are increasing complaints by laymen that the worship of the Church does not meet any vital needs in their lives. We may grant that there is urgent need in many Protestant churches to add beauty to worship and to learn from the historic liturgies the psychology of a unified service. But, after all these things are done, we must not lose sight of the fact that the only thing that enriches worship is the gaining of a clear idea of the object worshiped. We may change the form of our prayers, our anthems and our hymns, but until we have a God of whom we can sing and to whom we can pray, all external change in cultus will prove to be empty of religious significance.

The Church will not succeed in adjusting itself to the culture of our time until it makes a radical change in the concepts exalted in worship. The Church succeeded in ministering to the people of Greece, Rome and the nations of Europe during the Middle Ages because it was able to break away from the ideas of the Palestinian synagogue and create a worship through the Mysteries or Sacraments which met the religious needs of a

people whose faith grew out of the amalgamation of apostolic experience in Christ and the dogma of the early mystery religions. This form of worship, which served men so long as the ancient culture dominated Europe and the Americas, is still practiced by the Church, while that ancient culture has disappeared before the growth of the modern world. The worship of the Roman Catholic Church and, to a large extent, the Protestant Church, still rests upon the principles which grew out of the ancient world. It centers in the idea borrowed from the Mysteries of a god who died and rose again. The Mass is the dramatization of these dogmas. The eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine, which have miraculously become the body and blood of Christ, are supposed to unite the participant with the destiny of the dying and risen god, that the immortal life of the god may be shared by the communicant. While the Protestant has rejected the Mass, he attempts to create the same experience in his followers through hymns and sermons.

The worship of these Churches rests upon the assumption that man has no capacity within himself to win his salvation. He is taught to believe

that in his natural state he is doomed and can attain unto salvation only as he partakes of the grace which has been miraculously imparted to him. It is this assumption that separates the Church from an age which feels that man is not so helpless as tradition has pictured him and which is convinced that it can create a diviner world by working out its salvation.

Worship has been largely built on a dualism between the message of redemption and the ethical life. Newman assured us that the glory of the Roman Catholic faith was found in its distinction between faith and love. The old lady bows before the crucifix because she has faith, but she picks the pocket of the woman who kneels by her side because she does not have love. It was not many years ago that Protestantism was profoundly stirred by the publication of "Ecce Homo" because it placed strong emphasis on the human and ethical aspects of Jesus' life. Lord Shaftesbury called it "the most pestilential book that has ever been vomited forth from the jaws of hell." While both the Roman and Protestant Churches have recognized the ethical teaching of religion, their worship has centered about the

supernatural and salvation has been considered as something apart from the moral life. Indeed, both Churches have regarded the ethical teaching of Jesus as beyond human attainment. The moral idealism of the Gospel has been used by the preacher as an ideal to hold over his congregation, but it has seldom been taken seriously by the layman as a way of life. While it has been assumed that it had some indirect influence on living, the layman has gone forth to the world of politics, business and international relations guided by the principles of profits, power and dominion. He has not gone into the service of the Church primarily to find a principle that would affect his paying of wages or competing with his fellow men or guiding his conduct toward other nations, but to find "salvation."

This dualism between religion and ethics has been especially marked in statesmanship. The Bible of the Western world has been Machiavelli's *The Prince* rather than the words of Jesus. It is true that the Italian taught that "the prince must *appear* all sincerity, all uprightness, all humanity, all religion," but the end for which he was to rule was that the state might have expan-

sion and dominion and, hence, "Let the prince look to maintenance of the state; the means will always be deemed honorable and will receive general approbation." The churchmen, with few exceptions, including men from Bismarck to the statesmen who were accountable for the World War, have followed this teaching. They need not go to Machiavelli, as the Church itself offers them an abundant example of craft and deceit in diplomacy.

Now the Church confronts a modern world that has little interest in a salvation which is projected into the future and is largely divorced from ethical conduct in this present age. The worship of the Church centers around rituals and dogmas which do not seriously challenge man's daily action in the world of affairs. No wonder that the present day mind challenges the Church, in the words of Santayana, with the staggering assertion that the chief anxiety of religion "has been to offer imaginary remedies for mortal ills."

Reform in worship is needed in all churches, but reform is not enough. Nothing less than revolution in worship will meet the needs of men of the twentieth century. The Mass grew out of a

culture that has ceased to exist and must be frankly discarded to meet the spiritual needs of our generation. The sacramental ideas of baptism and penance came out of the Mysteries and have as little meaning for our day as do the religious ideas of that far-away age. The Church of England, the Episcopal Church in America and the Lutheran Church carry in essence the sacramental idea of the Roman Church, though they coat it over with a veneer of Protestantism, and are voices of the past trying to minister to the needs of the present. The non-ritualistic churches attempt to create, usually in a crude fashion, the spiritual sense of union with the substance of Deity through hymns, sermons and prayers. They can never succeed quite as well as those who use the dramatic Mass. Protestantism is becoming increasingly conscious of this fact and attempts to recover compensations in forms of "activities," reforms in worship and a rather feeble attempt to adjust itself to the modern world of thought. Nothing, however, could be more painfully evident than the chasm between the sermon of many hymns which the congregation sings, hymns which a forward-looking Protestant minister and the

express the thoughts and sentiments of an age that disappeared long ago. We venture to suggest some of the principles around which the worship of the Church must be created to meet present day culture.

First, revolution does not mean an entire break with the past. Religion belongs to the consciousness of the race and must be recognized as one of its precious possessions. Wherever men have gathered they have been conscious of the Other and have created their symbolism of worship to give expression to this consciousness. Their symbolism may be as crude as the antics of the African savage, or as beautiful and artistic as the service in the Christian cathedral, but in every case it represents the feeling of man that he is in the presence of the eternal and ineffable Mystery. Our world of culture does not escape this realm of the inscrutable. Herbert Spencer clearly recognized the fact that both religion and science meet on the common ground of the Unknowable. Whether man traces the meaning of life along the tortuous road of the theologian or along the complex and winding paths of the scientist, he comes at last to the realm before which the human mind

halts and wonders and adores. Morgan closes his Gifford lectures with the words: "I know full well that, with respect to much that I have said, I shall be charged with mysticism. So be it. In discussing emergent evolution I was faced by problems many and various. In spiritual regard I am faced by mystery. And in presence of mystery, the spiritual attitude, if monistic, cannot as I think be other than mystic." This is where all worship starts. The human consciousness, in every state of its development, has stood before the vast unknown and in its presence assumes the attitude of reverence. In this regard the worship of the present must be one with the worship of the past. Whenever the worship of the Church rests wholly upon the known, in any strict sense of knowing, it becomes cold and lifeless, failing in warmth and inspiration. It must preserve its unity with the religious experience of the race. It must bring man into the glorious presence of the "I Am," before which man will assume the attitude of adoration, a sense of the sacredness of the ineffable Whole.

While all worship must have its roots in the inscrutable, "a sense of something far more deeply

interfused," it must, if it is to maintain a sense of reality, live and move and have its being in the dominant moods of the generation to which it ministers. Worship can never escape symbolism, but it must symbolize that which is vital in the life of the age to which it speaks. The tragic fact that confronts the Church is that the moods which characterized the centuries out of which Christian worship grew have disappeared and the liturgies of the Church have become empty forms out of which the spirit has gone.

The chief change that has come in religious thought has been the loss of faith in the Supernatural, using the word in a traditional sense, and emphasis on the immanence of Deity which manifests itself through moral values. This manifestation of Deity will be found supremely, so far as the Church is concerned, in the ethical life of Jesus. While the Church will not fail to see Deity emerging in the successive stages of evolution, it will find the fullest expression of Deity at the emergent level which was manifested in the Man of Galilee. God as love revealed in the character of the Master, and man as becoming a son of God in proportion as he rises to the level

of love, will gradually take the place of God, the miracle worker, whether it be in the realm of nature or grace.

The worship of the Christian Church, during the past centuries, has gathered largely around the promise of the forgiveness of sins. It had reality to the worshiper because his whole conception of God and man made forgiveness the chief issue of life. It conceived of the world as a vast court. God was the Judge; man was the guilty culprit who had sinned in his first parent, Adam, and has continued to sin ever since. He was under condemnation and justly deserved the punishment which had been given to him. His greatest need was to escape this doom and when the Church, through its sacraments and theology, offered a way of escape, it was providing what was vital to man. Hence, when men went to the Church to worship, they believed they were receiving the greatest boon that could be given to mankind. Worship to them was not merely a pleasant, artistic performance, a combined sacred concert and lecture. It did something for men. It made possible escape from their future doom and the winning of future happiness. That this belief had

some effect upon their moral conduct is clear from the history of Christianity through the ages, but the chief good obtained was escape from the doom to which they were predestined.

But in the light of our belief in an evolving world and our faith in Deity immanent in the process, we no longer regard this world as a court of justice nor God as the Judge. Our world is not primarily a place where rewards and punishments are dispensed to the righteous and the wicked, but a place where the chief object of life is to adjust itself to its environment. We know that life survives only as it is able to meet and fit itself to the world in which it lives. It must be remembered that our environment is not a static, dead-level world, but a world that is always changing, becoming more complex and requiring greater complexity and richness of life in the individual who is to meet it. What was environment, for instance, to the passengers on the *Mayflower* would be a very simple affair compared to the man who lives in New York in this generation. The requirements to meet the world of New York, with its city population, its complexity of business, social and political relation-

ships, are much greater than the needs of the Pilgrim community. When we add to this environment the complexity of international relationships, of racial antagonisms, and the far-reaching moral demands, as men attempt to develop vast business corporations and political entanglements, we can realize something of the life required of man to meet this enlarging world. It is larger life that is needed, intellectual, moral and social, to fit oneself into this modern world. The question arises, Does the Church, through its worship, have anything to offer that will enable man to fit himself into this environment and build a better world? We grant that worship met a need and did something for men when they regarded their world as a court presided over by a Judge. But can the Church meet men who have ceased to think of their world in the ancient fashion and who are now intent upon building a manhood and a womanhood which will make a better social order? The present day dramatization of medievalism is offered to a generation that has ceased to be medieval. The worship of the Church must be more than a sacred concert or a religious lecture, if it is to meet the present day needs.

Through its worship it must lift men to a new level of life, giving to them the consciousness that it fits them to meet present demands and overcome the drag of the past, and send them forth fitted to build a new and better world.

We do not forget that not all men are builders. There are wounded souls, men who have lost in the battle of life, who have been cut and scarred by their sins and who are crying, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?" Sorrow frequently leaves a sting that numbs life and makes the future dark and unpromising. Disappointment takes courage from many lives and leaves them crippled along the way. Such people reach for cosmic support. They want a God who is a place of refuge in the time of trouble. Religion has always offered to such people a way of escape and it is not conceivable that any religion can long survive which does not offer help to the submerged in spirit.

But worship must offer such people a remedy that is real and not imaginary. There has been too much of a tendency to offer future compensations as a substitute for present evils. The great mass of toilers, who lived in poverty and

squalor through the ages, have too frequently been offered future happiness as a substitute for adequate wages and housing in this present world. The allurement of future rewards has too often made people at ease in Zion when they should have been using their brains to correct present evils. A large part of the suffering, disappointment and bitterness of men has come from social wrongs which might have been corrected by the application of wisdom and love to the problems of life. To offer men hope for the future as a substitute for reforms which might be won here is to turn worship into a mockery and to erect a God who is the supporter of ignorance and of oppressors, in place of the God who is working through the evolving world to create a diviner humanity.

Worship must not fail to offer hope to those who follow their loved ones to the grave nor to heal the broken-hearted who have been crushed beneath life's load. On the other hand, worship must never create a race of lazy men who excuse the ills and shortcomings of society by removing from men the responsibility to correct these evils, and push it on to the inscrutable Mystery. There

is probably no danger that the Church will cease to speak of hope for the broken-hearted; but until the Church, through its worship, arouses men to go forth as co-workers with God for the creation of a more livable world, there will always be a much larger proportion of sufferers on the earth than there is any need there should be.

Worship, both in the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, has lost many of the most intelligent Christians because the fundamental idea upon which it rests is no longer real to them. It no longer brings to them a feeling of the presence of God because it still presents God in the garb they have discarded. Protestants go to church and become an audience, a group of listeners. They no longer pray, but listen to the minister pray. They wait restlessly through the "opening service" for the sermon to begin. Professor Pratt, writing of the Catholic service, says: "In Italy and France, for example, there are a great many good men—nominally Catholics—to whom the Mass is simply foolishness. To them, the Latin mumbling of the priest is a useless repetition, and the incense and candles are a kind of earnest nonsense. Not believing strongly or at all in the real

presence . . . they fail to get anything out of the service, hence they stay away." [1] Nothing can be more evident than the fact that both Protestants and Catholics remain away from the Church because they feel the meaninglessness of the worship, yet retain a feeling of sympathy with the Church. They would like to see it offer them something real and they believe it could do so. They would like to see the Church linked with present life and become again the inspiration of its adherents, but the Church at present fails to give them what they ask.

Before the Church will meet this need it must break with the past and clearly recognize and define what its task is. This will not be easy to accomplish. The Church has never yet seriously undertaken the task of lifting the present world to the emergent level of Deity as it was manifested in the moral attitude of Jesus. The actual degeneration of the Church began when she conquered Rome. For generations she had not given any thought to the redemption of the present world. She expected daily that all governments on earth would suddenly come to an end, Christ

[1] *The Religious Consciousness*, p. 300.

would return and the faithful would be taken by him to his eternal kingdom. But, as the generations passed and Christ had not returned, and as the Church became a ruler over the secular affairs of Rome and Christians turned to the creation of government and the social structure, then they faced the serious question as to what manner of men they should be as they undertook these tasks. The moral standards of the Christ seemed too high for mortal men to follow. The result was that they remained churchly in their dogmas and became secular in their conduct. The ethics of the pagan European became their ethics, while their lips mumbled the ritual and theology of the Church. They made a sharp distinction between faith and love. They reserved the former for the Church, but they declared the impossibility of the latter in their daily life. The result was that, as statesmen, as social builders and in their private life, they followed the ways of their barbarian inheritance, while they took the Mass as their guarantee of salvation from future torment. The statesmen of Europe, for the most part churchmen, have never risen above the trickery and selfishness of their early forbears,

and the Church, whenever it has entered the temporal realm, has made no attempt to rise above the moral level of contemporary life. It is much more than a half truth that Christianity has never yet been tried. Until the Church sincerely faces this fact and has the courage to attempt to bring the world to a new level of life, it will have no leadership to offer men who are crying for a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

The worship of the Church must create in men a confidence that they are equal, with the help of God, for such a task. Here, again, the Church confronts the precedent of ages. It has always taught man that he had no ability within himself to win his salvation. It has always asked man to come as a penitent who was under condemnation. The sentence of doom had been pronounced upon him and his only hope of escape was the free gift of grace. "Nothing in my hands I bring, simply to the cross I cling," has been the mood of man as he has entered his place of worship. But the modern man has something to bring. He brings Deity that is immanent in his life and which manifests itself in creative mind, in moral idealism, in social aspiration and in political achievements.

When he sits in the classroom of the university, in the atmosphere of free inquiry, he is made to feel that he may learn and master the laws and forces of his world. Nothing there is a free gift. All comes by investigation, work and discipline. He knows that if he is true to the method of acquisition, he may ultimately go forth to build a more efficient industrial world and create a more livable social realm. He is not inclined to go into a Church which makes him feel his helplessness. He awaits inspiration. He seeks new motivation, wisdom, a better understanding of the forces by which he is to reconstruct his world. Unless the Church, through its worship, can give him these things, he will turn away from the Church with a feeling that she has no part in these new times.

The Church will never accomplish this until, through its worship, it can make this man, with his new sense of power, feel that his task, as well as the whole course of the developing world, has a spiritual significance. Indeed, this is the supreme work which lies before the Church. The man who is the product of our modern educational system comes from it with a mechanistic concep-

tion of life. This is not necessarily because the teachers of our colleges hold personally to a mechanistic universe. They may hold just the opposite. But the method of science is essentially mechanistic and the sciences rule in our educational system. The college of our earlier history placed the emphasis on the humanities. Language, literature, history and philosophy occupied the larger portion of the time of the student. Science was secondary. But in most of our state universities of the present, as well as in the smaller colleges, the curriculum has been reversed. Sciences are uppermost and the humanities are secondary. Hence, the men who come from these schools are skilled in the method of mechanism. When they enter into our industrial civilization, they live and move and have their being in mechanism. While this does not deal with the fundamental nature of existence, it is easy for such men to regard the whole of life as soulless and the evolution of our world the result of wheels and cogs.

It is the task of the Church to bring men to the realization of a world that has Creative Purpose at the heart of it, a living God who is the

Power by which emergents emerge. No wonder men feel they have been given a stone when the whole liturgy of the Church drags them away to the conception of a God who apparently has nothing to do with the making of the present world and whose only function seems to be that of a parole officer who gets them out of prison. The man of our day waits for a new worship that will send him back to his task with the feeling that he is working through mechanism with a God who is in the whole process, who has been manifesting his glory through successive levels of moral values, that the Deity in the process of nature and history has burst upon the world at a new level in the Christ, a level of love and good-will, toward which all the nations look for deliverance. Then his whole life comes to have religious significance. The task at which he works is divine and the goal for which he strives is the emergence of the Kingdom of God upon the earth.

It follows from what has been said that every service of worship must be so organized that there will be created in the worshiper a consciousness that he is in fellowship with a God who is working in the world for a kingdom of moral values

and that the chief aim of man is to go forth from the Church to use the best life he possesses to attain that end. We have already said that in the past worship accomplished something for the worshiper. It made him feel that he had escaped the doom that was resting upon him and that his safety in the future world was assured. This end of worship is no longer enough to satisfy the modern man. Yet if worship is to continue it must accomplish something for those who gather about the altar. It must make them not only better men, but men whose lives are dedicated in a greater loyalty to the supreme purpose toward which the Creative God is working in the emerging levels of moral values. It should be beautiful, employing all that art can contribute to the end to be achieved. But when art becomes a means of lulling men to a moral sleep, when it neither offends the esthetic sense nor challenges the moral conscience, it has ceased to be Christian and becomes a hindrance to the aim of the Christian life. Nothing can have any place in the worship of the future which does not make man feel that he receives in the Church a motivation which will enable him to dedicate his life to the task of

building a world of which he has learned through the cultural agencies and the idealism of his time. Instead of causing him to feel when he enters the Church that he has entered into an atmosphere which is foreign to the world with which his daily life has made him familiar, he must find that the Church is a place where his whole life, and that of the world which he has temporarily left behind, are lifted into the presence of God and that he is fitted through worship to make the world to which he will return more godlike.

To accomplish this end, worship must give to man a sense of power rather than being organized to make him feel his helplessness and absolute dependence upon a Savior who is to do everything for him. "Nothing in my hands I bring" was a mood born out of a day when man was a convicted criminal whose only hope was to have someone take his place before the judge of the court. To-day we are not concerned about escaping a future punishment. Our one aim is to work with the God of moral values in building a better humanity on the earth. This task rests upon us. It is a tremendous task. It involves the creation of a mental attitude which believes the task possible. We have so long proceeded upon the pagan

ethics in our national and international relations that men hesitate to believe that the world can be remade on the emergent level of Christian virtues. We have so long regarded every nation outside of our own as our natural enemy, and we have so long defined a diplomat as a man sent abroad to lie for his country, that we have acquiesced in this paganism. The task of recreating the mental attitude of men toward the world of affairs, including industry and politics, is an urgent work which rests upon the Church. Worship must be made to contribute to this education of the human race.

Added to the work of education must come the work of motivation. This is the most important function of worship. The man who is brought into the presence of the God of moral values must rise with his lips touched by the coals from the altar, crying from the depth of his awakened soul, "Here am I; send me." Instead of making him feel his helplessness in the winning of his salvation, he must be made to feel that he is a crusader, who by the help of the indwelling Deity can yet make a world which will be a more glorious manifestation of the Divine Striver at the heart of the evolving social order.

Instead of erecting miracle, either of nature or grace, as the center of worship, the Church must place the Christ of moral idealism as the center of its worship. The Virgin Birth, the Immaculate Conception, the miracle of the Mass and the Resurrection belong to a conception of Deity that once played an important part in the life of nations, but miracle belongs to an age that has passed. Miracle failed to lead the Church to answer its prayer, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, *on earth* as it is in heaven." From the days when the Church became triumphant in Rome, exalting dogma and sacrament to the rank of first importance, the Church lost its moral idealism and left its membership to walk the ways of secularism in the affairs of life. The world has passed beyond the dogmas and sacraments which grew out of Greek metaphysics and the mystery religions and now asks for the very idealism which the Church has so long neglected. The day has come when the Church must again place the ethical Christ at the center of its worship, that the worshipers may be lifted to a moral level for which the world longs as it confronts war and discord between nations.

Churchmen with the traditional mind will reply that this reduces religion to a mere reform movement, robbing religion entirely of the work of redemption. What has it to offer the sinner? How shall it take away his sins? We reply that these are questions that are raised by men who are still under the traditional idea that sin involves guilt and that it is not so much the sin that is to be removed as the punishment that was incurred by the guilt. We are no longer concerned about this question. The whole system of theology that gave birth to it is in bankruptcy. Our interest lies in having man turn from his sin, that is, his unsocial living, and turn to a rich life, both as an individual and in his social relationships. The only sure way of leading him to such an end is to inspire him to turn with enthusiasm to a life of positive and constructive moral values. In proportion as a *new mind* possesses him and a new motivation comes to him from the realization of that mind, he will be redeemed from his past and set his face toward a better future.

Such worship will not create in man a feeling of safety but a mood of adventure. This is the point of most radical departure from the past.

When men felt they were doomed to eternal punishment unless the Church interposed in their behalf, nothing could be a greater boon to man than the assurance that he had escaped that tragic end and would enjoy eternal felicity. The peace of soul that came to such men is past description. The Church was indeed to them a haven of rest, and religion brought a priceless gift. But, because the majority of men of the twentieth century no longer believe in eternal punishment, the Church can no longer create this assurance and the consequent peace which it gave to our fathers.

William James, whose philosophy was, in part at least, an expression of twentieth century American life, probably pictured the conception of the universe which is held, in practice if not in theory, by our average citizen. He presents the Author of the universe as saying: "I am going to make a world not certain to be saved, a world the perfection of which shall be conditional, the condition being that each several agent does its own 'level best.' I offer you the chance of taking part in such a world. Its safety, you see, is unwarranted. It is a real adventure, with real danger, yet it may win through. It is a scheme of coöperative work

genuinely to be done. Will you join the procession? Will you trust yourself and trust the other agents enough to face the risks?" [2] It is not a world that has been ordained to culminate in a certain way. If that were true, all we would have to do would be to sit down and let it come out that way. This is what many people try to do. They look for a religion that will lull them to sleep, a God about whose neck they can throw their arms and feel that all is well. Traditional Christianity has fostered this kind of religion to a large extent. But experience has taught us that we are not living in that kind of a universe. There is no assurance that it will come out all right. It may yet go to destruction. There is no such thing as inevitable progress. We were just beginning to rest upon such a comforting doctrine when the World War awakened us from our slumbers. The present situation of affairs constantly reminds us that our civilization may yet be lost in a bloody Armageddon. Our whole life in this universe is an adventure and unless we do our part the end may be an unspeakable tragedy.

Worship, to satisfy our day, must create the

[2] *Pragmatism*, p. 290.

spirit of courageous adventure. Weak-minded people may enter the Church to be lulled to sleep, but people who have strength of character are "willing to take the universe to be really dangerous, without backing out and crying 'no play.'" They know they are not alone in the adventure. There are other people to help them. They believe there is also a God to aid in the battle. God is only one force among many, but he is a very real Power who worketh in men to will and to do for his good pleasure. By all the forces together, if men are faithful, a better world may be won. Men wait for the Church to unite all these agents, to make life one great adventure, that evils may not be treated by imaginary remedies, but that they may be dropped overboard, one by one, and, thus far, that the world may be saved from moral and social tragedy. It is the supreme work of worship to enter this world of risk and challenge men to their supreme task, that they may go from the Church to fulfill their purpose in the evolving universe.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01246 9674